A GRAMMAR

OF THE

HEBREW LANGUAGE.

BY

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN,

THIRD EDITION, 1872.

The Wisdom of God is revealed in many ways. His creation testifies of it in ever so many wondrous and beautiful ways. It is my belief that, in keeping with the pattern of creation, the Word of God, no matter how oft explored and extensively studied, still holds vast treasures of beauty yet undiscovered.
It is my hope that you will find the freshness of discovery enticing enough to keep you coming back for more and more understanding of the Word of our Lord, and the fascinating language it was given in.

A

GRAMMAR

OF THE

HEBREW LANGUAGE.

BY

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT PRINCETON, N. J.

THIRD EDITION,

PREFACE.

THIS work was begun at the instance of my friend, preceptor, and colleague, DR. J. ADDISON ALEXANDER. The aid of his counsels and suggestions was freely promised in the undertaking; and he was to give to it the sanction of his name before the public. It appears shorn of these advantages. A few consultations respecting the general plan of the book and the method to be observed in its preparation, were all that could be had before this greatest of American orientalists and scholars was taken from us. Deprived thus early of his invaluable assistance, I have yet found a melancholy satisfaction in the prosecution of a task begun under such auspices, and which seemed still to link me to one with whom I count it one of the greatest blessings of my life to have been associated.

The grammatical system of Gesenius has, from causes which can readily be explained, had a predominance in this country to which it is not justly entitled. The grammar of Prof. Stuart, for a long time the text-book in most common use, was substantially a reproduction of that of Gesenius. Nordheimer was an adherent of the same system in its essential features, though he illustrated it with wonderful clearness and philosophical tact. And finally, the smaller grammar of Gesenius became current in the excellent translation of Prof. Conant. Now, while Gesenius is unquestionably the prince of Hebrew lexicographers, Ewald is as certainly entitled to

the precedence among grammarians; and the latter cannot be ignored by him who would appreciate correctly the existing state of oriental learning.

The present work is mainly based upon the three leading grammars of Gesenius, Ewald, and Nordheimer, and the attempt has been made to combine whatever is valuable in each. For the sake of a more complete survey of the history of opinion, the grammars of R. Chayug, R. Kimchi, Reuchlin, Buxtorf, Schultens, Simonis, Robertson, Lee, Stier, Hupfeld, Freytag, Nägelsbach, and Stuart, besides others of less consequence from Jewish or Christian sources, have also been consulted to a greater or less extent. The author has not, however, contented himself with an indolent compilation; but, while availing himself freely of the labours of his predecessors, he has sought to maintain an independent position by investigating the whole subject freshly and thoroughly for himself. His design in the following pages has been to reflect the phenomena of the language precisely as they are exhibited in the Hebrew Bible; and it is believed that this is more exactly accomplished than it has been in any preceding grammar. The rule was adopted at the outset, and rigorously adhered to, that no supposititious forms should be admitted, that no example should be alleged which is not found in actual use, that no statement should be made and no rule given the evidence of which had not personally been subjected to careful scrutiny. Thus, for example, before treating of any class of verbs, perfect or imperfect, every verb of that description in the language was separately traced through all its forms as shown by a concordance; the facts were thus absolutely ascertained in the first instance before a single paradigm was prepared or a word of explanation written.

Some may be disposed, at first, to look suspiciously upon the triple division of the Hebrew vowels, adopted

from Ewald, as an innovation: further reflection, however, will show that it is the only division consistent with accuracy, and it is really more ancient than the one which commonly prevails.

The importance of the accent, especially to the proper understanding of the vowels of a word and the laws of vowel-changes, is such that the example of Ewald has been followed in constantly marking its position by an appropriate sign. He uses a Methegh for this purpose, which is objectionable on account of the liability to error and confusion when the same sign is used for distinct purposes. The use of any one of the many Hebrew accents would also be liable to objection, since they not only indicate the tone-syllable, but have besides a conjunctive or disjunctive force, which it would be out of place to suggest. Accordingly, a special symbol has been employed, analogous to that which is in use in our own and other languages, thus קָטַל *kātal'*.

The remarks upon the consecution of poetic accents were in type before the appearance of the able discussion of that subject by Baer, in an appendix to the Commentary of Delitzsch upon the Psalms. The rules of Baer, however, depend for their justification upon the assumption of the accurate accentuation of his own recent edition of the Hebrew Psalter, which departs in numerous instances from the current editions as they do in fact from one another. Inasmuch as this is a question which can only be settled by manuscripts that are not accessible in this country, it seems best to wait until it has been tested and pronounced upon by those who are capable of doing so. What has here been written on that subject, has accordingly been suffered to remain, imperfect and unsatisfactory as it is.

The laws which regulate the formation of nouns have been derived from Ewald, with a few modifications chiefly tending to simplify them.

The declensions of nouns, as made out by Gesenius, have the merit of affording a convenient and tolerably complete classification of their forms and of the changes to which each is liable. Nordheimer abandoned them for a method of his own, in which he aimed at greater simplicity, but in reality rendered the subject more perplexed. The system of Ewald is complicated with the derivation and formation of nouns, from which their subsequent modifications are quite distinct. The fact is, however, that there are no declensions, properly speaking, in Hebrew; and the attempt to foist upon the language what is alien to its nature, embarrasses the subject instead of relieving it. A few general rules respecting the vowel-changes, which are liable to occur in different kinds of syllables, solve the whole mystery, and are all that the case requires or even admits.

In the syntax the aim has been to develop not so much what is common to the Hebrew with other languages, as what is characteristic and distinctive of the former, those points being particularly dwelt upon which are of chief importance to the interpreter.

In the entire work special reference has been had to the wants of theological students. The author has endeavoured to make it at once elementary and thorough, so that it might both serve as a manual for beginners and yet possess all that completeness which is demanded by riper scholars. The parts of most immediate importance to those commencing the study of the language are distinguished by being printed in large type.

PRINCETON, *August 22d*, 1861.

CONTENTS.

PART I.—ORTHOGRAPHY.

Divisions of Grammar, § 1.

ORTHOGRAPHIC SYMBOLS.

THE LETTERS.—Alphabet, § 2; Sounds, § 3; Double forms, § 4; Names, § 5; Order, § 6; Classification, § 7; Words never divided, § 8; Abbreviations and Signs of Number, § 9.

THE VOWELS.—Masoretic Points, § 10; Vowel Letters, § 11; Signs for the Vowels, § 12; Mutual Relation of this twofold Notation, §§ 13, 14; Pure and Diphthongal Vowels, § 15.

Sh'va, silent and vocal, simple and compound, § 16.

Pattahh Furtive, § 17.

Syllables, § 18.

Ambiguous Signs.—Hhirik, Shurek, and Kibbuts, § 19. 1; Kamets and Kamets-Hhatuph, § 19. 2; Silent and Vocal Sh'va, § 20.

POINTS AFFECTING CONSONANTS:—Daghesh-lene, §§ 21, 22.

Daghesh-forte, § 23; different kinds, § 24; omission of, § 25.

Mappik, § 26.

Raphe, § 27.

POINTS ATTACHED TO WORDS.—Accents, their design, § 28; forms and classes, § 29; like forms distinguished, § 30; poetic accents, § 31; position as determined by the character of the syllables, § 32. 1; in uninflected words, § 32. 2. 3; with affixes, suffixes and prefixes, § 33; use in distinguishing words, § 34; shifted in special cases, § 35.

Consecution of the Accents in Prose.—Clauses and their subdivisions, § 36; tabular view, § 37; explanation of the table, § 38; adaptation of the trains of accents to sentences, § 39.

PART II.—ETYMOLOGY.

PART III.—SYNTAX.

PART FIRST.

ORTHOGRAPHY.

§1. LANGUAGE is the communication of thought by means of spoken or written sounds. The utterance of a single thought constitutes a sentence. Each sentence is composed of words expressing individual conceptions or their relations. And words are made up of sounds produced by the organs of speech and represented by written signs. It is the province of grammar as the science of language to investigate these several elements. It hence consists of three parts. First, Orthography, which treats of the sounds employed and the mode of representing them. Second, Etymology, which treats of the different kinds of words, their formation, and the changes which they undergo. Third, Syntax, which treats of sentences, or the manner in which words are joined together to express ideas. The task of the Hebrew grammarian is to furnish a complete exhibition of the phenomena of this particular language, carefully digested and referred as far as practicable to their appropriate causes in the organs of speech and the operations of the mind.

THE LETTERS.

§2. The Hebrew being no longer a spoken tongue, is only known as the language of books, and particularly of the Old Testament, which is the most interesting and important as well as the only pure monument of it. The first step

1

towards its investigation must accordingly be to ascertain the meaning of the symbols in which it is recorded. Then having learned its sounds, as they are thus represented, it will be possible to advance one step further, and inquire into the laws by which these are governed in their employment and mutations.

The symbols used in writing Hebrew are of two sorts, viz. letters (אוֹתִיּוֹת) and points (נְקֻדִּים). The number of the letters is twenty-two; these are written from right to left, and are exclusively consonants. The following alphabetical table exhibits their forms, English equivalents, names, and numerical values, together with the corresponding forms of the Rabbinical character employed to a considerable extent in the commentaries and other writings of the modern Jews.

Order.	Forms and Equivalents.		Names.		Rabbinical Alphabet.	Numerical values.
1	א	———	אָלֶף	Áleph	פ	1
2	ב	Bh, B	בֵּית	Bēth	נ	2
3	ג	Gh, G	גִּימֶל	Gī′-mel	ג	3
4	ד	Dh, D	דָּלֶת	Dā′-leth	ד	4
5	ה	H	הֵא	Hē	ס	5
6	ו	V	וָו	Vāv	ו	6
7	ז	Z	זַיִן	Záyin	ז	7
8	ח	Hh	חֵית	Hhēth	ף	8
9	ט	T	טֵית	Tēth	ע	9
10	י	Y	יוֹד	Yōdh	׳	10
11	ד כ	Kh, K	כַּף	Kaph	כ ך	20
12	ל	L	לָמֶד	Lā′-medh	ל	30
13	ם מ	M	מֵם	Mēm	מ ס	40
14	ן נ	N	נוּן	Nūn	כ ן	50
15	ס	S	סָמֶך	Sā′-mekh	ס	60
16	ע	———	עַיִן	Áyin	ע	70
17	ה פ	Ph, P	פֵּא	Pē	פ ף	80
18	ץ צ	Ts	צָדֵי	Tsā′-dhē	צ ן	90
19	ק	K	קוֹף	Kōph	ק	100
20	ר	R	רֵישׁ	Rēsh	ר	200
21	שׁ	Sh, S	שִׁין	Shīn	ש	300
22	ת	Th, T	תָּו	Tāv	ת	400

§3. There is always more or less difficulty in representing the sounds of one language by those of another. But this is in the case of the Hebrew greatly aggravated by its having been for ages a dead language, so that some of its

sounds cannot now be accurately determined, and also by its belonging to a different family or group of tongues from our own, possessing sounds entirely foreign to the English, for which it consequently affords no equivalent, and which are in fact incapable of being pronounced by our organs. The equivalents of the foregoing table are not therefore to be regarded as in every instance exact representations of the proper powers of the letters. They are simply approximations sufficiently near the truth for every practical purpose, the best which can now be proposed, and sanctioned by tradition and the conventional usage of the best Hebraists.

1. It will be observed that a double pronunciation has been assigned to seven of the letters. A native Hebrew would readily decide without assistance which of these was to be adopted in any given case, just as we are sensible of no inconvenience from the various sounds of the English letters which are so embarrassing to foreigners learning our language. The ambiguity is in every case removed, however, by the addition of a dot or point indicating which sound they are to receive. Thus ב with a point in its bosom has the sound of *b*, ב unpointed that of the corresponding *v*, or as it is commonly represented for the sake of uniformity in notation, *bh;* ג is pronounced as *g*, ג unpointed had an aspirated sound which may accordingly be represented by *gh*, but as it is difficult to produce it, or even to determine with exactness what it was, and as there is no corresponding sound in English, the aspiration is mostly neglected, and the letter, whether pointed or not, sounded indifferently as *g;* ד is *d*, ד unpointed is the aspirate *dh*, equivalent to *th* in *the;* כ is *k*, כ unpointed its aspirate *kh*, perhaps resembling the German *ch* in *ich*, though its aspiration, like that of ג, is commonly neglected in modern reading; פ is *p*, פ unpointed is *ph* or *f;* ת is *t*, ת unpointed *th* in *thin*. The letter שׁ with a dot over its right arm is pronounced like *sh*, and called *Shīn;* שׂ with a dot over its left arm is called *Sīn*, and pronounced like *s*, no attempt being made in modern

usage to discriminate between its sound and that of ס Samekh. Although there may anciently have been a distinc-tion between them, this can no longer be defined nor even positively asserted; it has therefore been thought unneces-sary to preserve the individuality of these letters in the notation, and both of them will accordingly be represented by *s*.

a. The double sound of the first six of the letters just named is purely euphonic, and has no effect whatever upon the meaning of the words in which they stand. The case of שׁ is different. Its primary sound was that of *sh*, as is evident from the contrast in Judg. 12 : 6 of שִׁבֹּלֶת *shibbōleth* with סִבֹּלֶת *sibbōleth*. In certain words, however, and sometimes for the sake of creating a distinction between different words of like orthography, it received the sound of *s*, thus almost assuming the character of a distinct letter, e. g. שָׁבַר *to break*, שָׂבַר *to hope*. That Sin and Samekh were dis-tinguishable to the ear, appears probable from the fact that there are words of separate significations which differ only in the use of one or the other of these letters, and in which they are never interchanged, e. g. שָׁכַל *to be bereaved*, שָׂכַל *to be wise*, סָכַל *to be foolish ;* שָׁכַר *to be drunken*, שָׂכַר *to hire,* סָכַר *to shut up ;* שׁוּר *to look,* שׂוּר *to rule,* סוּר *to turn back ;* שָׂפָה *a lip,* סָפָה *to destroy*. The close affinity between the sounds which they repre-sent is, however, shown by the fact that ס is in a few instances written for שׂ, e. g. נִסָּה Ps. 4: 7 from נָשָׂא, שִׂכְלוּת Eccles. 1 : 17 for סִכְלוּת . The original identity of שׂ and שׁ is apparent from the etymological connection between שְׂאֹר *leaven* and מִשְׁאֶרֶת *a vessel in which bread is leavened ;* שָׂעַר *to shudder,* שַׂעֲרוּר *horrible, causing a shudder*. In Arabic the division of single letters into two distinguished by diacritical points is carried to a much greater length, the alphabet of that language being by this means enlarged from twenty-two to twenty-eight letters

2. In their original power ט *t* differed from תּ *t*, and כּ *k* from ק *k*, for these letters are not confused nor liable to inter-change, and the distinction is preserved to this day in the cognate Arabic; yet it is not easy to state intelligibly where-in the difference consisted. They are currently pronounced precisely alike.

3. The letter ח has a stronger sound than ה the simple *h*, and is accordingly represented by *hh ;* ר is represented by *r*, although it had some peculiarity of sound which we can-not at this day attempt to reproduce, by which it was allied to the gutturals.

4. For two letters, א and ע, no equivalent has been given in the table, and they are commonly altogether neglected in pronunciation. א is the weakest of the letters, and was probably always inaudible. It stands for the slight and involuntary emission of breath necessary to the utterance of a vowel unattended by a more distinct consonant sound. It therefore merely serves to mark the beginning or the close of the syllable of which it is a part, while to the ear it is entirely lost in the accompanying or preceding vowel. Its power has been likened to that of the smooth breathing (') of the Greeks or the English silent *h* in *hour*. On the other hand ע had a deep guttural sound which was always heard, but like that of the corresponding letter among the Arabs is very difficult of utterance by occidental organs; consequently no attempt is made to reproduce it. In the Septuagint it is sometimes represented by γ, sometimes by the rough and sometimes by the smooth breathing; thus עֲמֹרָה Γόμοῤῥα, עֵלִי ʿHλί, עֲמָלֵק ʾΑμαλήκ. Some of the modern Jews give it the sound of *ng* or of the French *gn* in *campagne*, either wherever it occurs or only at the end of words, e. g. שְׁמַע *Sh'mang*, עָמֹד *gnāmōdh*.

§4. The forms of the letters exhibited in the preceding table, though found without important variation in all existing manuscripts, are not the original ones. An older character is preserved upon the Jewish coins struck in the age of the Maccabees, which bears a considerable resemblance to the Samaritan and still more to the Phenician. Some of the steps in the transition from one to the other can still be traced upon extant monuments. There was first a cursive tendency, disposing to unite the different letters of the same word, which is the established practice in Syriac and Arabic. This was followed by a predominance of the calligraphic principle, which again separated the letters and reduced them to their present rectangular forms and nearly uniform size. The cursive stage has, however, left its traces upon the five letters

which appear in the table with double forms ; צ פ נ מ כ when standing at the beginning or in the middle of words termi- nate in a bottom horizontal stroke, which is the remnant of the connecting link with the following letter ; at the end of words no such link was needed, and the letter was continued vertically downward in a sort of terminal flourish thus, ץ ף ן ך, or closed up by joining its last with its initial stroke, thus ם.

a. The few instances in which final letters are found in the middle of words, as לְמַרְבֵּה Isa. 9: 6, or their ordinary forms at the end, as הֵמִ Neh. 2: 13, מִנ Job 38: 1, are probably due to the inadvertence of early tran- scribers which has been faithfully perpetuated since, or if intentional they may have had a connection now unknown with the enumeration of letters or the signification of words. The same may be said of letters larger than usual, as וְכַּנֶּה Ps. 80: 16, or smaller, as בְּהִבָּרְאָם Gen. 2: 4, or above the line, as מִיַּעַר Ps. 80: 14, or inverted, as בִּסֹעַ Num. 10: 35, (in manuscripts and the older editions, e. g. that of Stephanus in 1541), or with extraordinary points, as וַיִּשָּׁקֵהוּ Gen. 33: 4, לוּלֵא Ps. 27: 13, in all which the Rabbins find concealed meanings of the most fanciful and absurd character. Thus in their opinion the suspended נ in מְנַשֶּׁה Judg. 18: 30 suggests that the idola- ters described were descended from Moses but had the character of Ma- nasseh. In גָּחֹון Lev. 11: 42 the Vav, which is of unusual size, is the middle letter of the Pentateuch ; וּבֵינֶיךָ Gen. 16: 5 with an extraordinary point over the second Yodh, is the only instance in which the word is written with that letter ; the large letters in Deut. 6: 4 emphasize the capital article of the Jewish faith. All such anomalous forms or marks, with the conceits of the Rabbins respecting them, are reviewed in detail in Buxtorf's Tiberias, pp. 152 etc.

§5. All the names of the letters were probably significant at first, although the meanings of some of them are now doubt- ful or obscure. It is commonly supposed that these describe the objects to which their forms originally bore a rude resem- blance. If this be so, however, the mutations which they have since undergone are such, that the relation is no longer traceable, unless it be faintly in a few. The power of the letter is in every instance the initial sound of its name.

a. The opinion advocated by Schultens, Fundamenta Ling. Heb. p. 10, that the invention of the letters was long anterior to that of their names, and that the latter was a pedagogical expedient to facilitate the learning of the letters by associating their forms and sounds with familiar objects, has met with little favour and possesses little intrinsic probability. An interest-

ing corroboration of the antiquity of these names is found in their preserva
tion in the Greek alphabet, though destitute of meaning in that language,
the Greeks having borrowed their letters at an early period from the Phe-
nicians, and hence the appended *a* of Ἄλφα, etc., which points to the Ara-
maeic form אַלְפָא.

b. The Semitic derivation of the names proves incontestably that the
alphabet had its origin among a people speaking a language kindred to
the Hebrew. Their most probable meanings, so far as they are still ex-
plicable, are as follows, viz: Aleph, *an ox;* Beth, *a house;* Gimel, *a camel;*
Daleth, *a door;* He, doubtful, possibly *a window;* Vav, *a hook;* Zayin, *a
weapon;* Hheth, probably *a fence;* Teth, probably *a snake;* Yodh, *a hand;*
Kaph, *the palm of the hand;* Lamedh, *an ox-goad;* Mem, *water;* Nun, *a
fish;* Samekh, *a prop;* Ayin, *an eye;* Pe, *a mouth;* Tsadhe, *a fish-hook* or
a hunter's dart; Koph, perhaps *the back of the head;* Resh, *a head;* Shin,
a tooth; Tav, *a cross mark.*

§6. The order of the letters appears to be entirely arbi-
trary, though it has been remarked that the three middle
mutes ד ג ב succeed each other, as in like manner the three
liquids נ מ ל. The juxtaposition of a few of the letters may
perhaps be owing to the kindred signification of their names,
e. g. Yodh and Kaph *the hand*, Mem *water* and Nun *a fish*,
Resh *the head* and Shin *a tooth*. The antiquity of the existing
arrangement of the alphabet is shown, 1. by psalms and other
portions of the Old Testament in which successive clauses or
verses begin with the letters disposed in regular order, viz.
Ps. 25 (ק omitted), 34, 37 (alternate verses, ע omitted), 111
(every clause), 112 (every clause), 119 (each letter eight
times), 145 (נ omitted), Prov. 31 : 10–31, Lam. ch. 1, 2, 3
(each letter three times), 4. In the first chapter of Lamenta-
tions the order is exactly preserved, but in the remaining
three chapters ע and פ are transposed. 2. By the corres-
pondence of the Greek and Roman alphabets, which have
sprung from the same origin with the Hebrew.

a. The most ingenious attempt to discover a regular structure in the
Hebrew alphabet is that of Lepsius, in an essay upon this subject published
in 1836. Omitting the sibilants and Resh, he finds the following triple
correspondence of a breathing succeeded by the same three mutes carried
through each of the three orders, the second rank being enlarged by the
addition of the liquids.

	Breathings.	Mutes.		Liquids.
Middle	א	ד ג ב		
Smooth	ה	ט ח ו	(כי)	נ מ ל
Rough	ע	ת ק פ		

Curious as this result certainly is, it must be confessed that the alleged correspondence is in part imaginary, and the method by which it is reached is too arbitrary to warrant the conclusion that this scheme was really in the mind of the author of the alphabet, much less to sustain the further speculations built upon it, reducing the original number and modifying the powers of the letters.

b. It is curious to see how, in the adaptation of the alphabet to different languages, the sounds of the letters have been modified, needless ones dropped, and others found necessary added at the end, without disturbing the arrangement of the original stock. Thus the Greeks dropped ו and ק, only retaining them as numerical signs, while the Roman alphabet has F and Q; on the other hand the Romans found צ and ס superfluous, while the Greeks made of them ϑ and ξ; ג and ז, in Greek γ and ζ, become in Latin C and G, while ח, in Latin H, is in Greek converted like the rest of the gutturals into a vowel η.

§ 7. The letters may be variously divided:

1. First, with respect to the organs by which they are pronounced.

Gutturals   א   ה   ח   ע
Palatals   ג   י   כ   ק
Linguals   ד   ט   ל   נ   ת
Dentals   ז   ס   צ   ש
Labials   ב   ו   מ   פ

ר has been differently classed, but as its peculiarities are those of the gutturals, it is usually reckoned with them.

2. Secondly, according to their respective strength, into three classes, which may be denominated weak, medium, and strong. The strong consonants offer the greatest resistance to change, and are capable of entering into any combinations which the formation or inflection of words may require. The weak have not this capacity, but when analogy would bring them into combinations foreign to their nature, they are either

liable to mutation themselves or occasion changes in the rest of the word. Those of medium strength have neither the absolute stability of the former nor the feeble and fluctuating character of the latter.

| Weak, | { | א ה ו י | Vowel-Letters, |
| | | א ה ח ע | Gutturals. |

| Medium, | { | ר נ מ ל | Liquids, |
| | | ז ס צ שׁ | Sibilants. |

| Strong, | { פ ב
ק כ ג
ט ת ד | } Aspirates and Mutes. |

The special characteristics of these several classes and the influence which they exert upon the constitution of words will be considered hereafter. It is sufficient to remark here that the vowel-letters are so called because they sometimes represent not consonant but vowel-sounds.

a. It will be observed that while the *p, k,* and *t*-mutes agree in having smooth פ כ ת and middle forms ד ג ב, which may be either aspirated or unaspirated, the two last have each an additional representative ט ק which is lacking to the first. This, coupled with the fact that two of the alphabetic Psalms, Ps. 25, 34, repeat פ as the initial of the closing verse, has given rise to the conjecture that the missing *p* mute was supplied by this letter, having a double sound and a double place in the alphabet. In curious coincidence with this ingenious but unsustained hypothesis, the Ethiopic alphabet has an additional *p,* and the Greek and Roman alphabets agree one step and only one beyond the letter T, viz. in adding next a labial, which in Greek is divided into υ and ϕ, and in Latin into U and V, as י into I and J.

3. Thirdly, The letters may be divided, with respect to their function in the formation of words, into radicals and serviles. The former, which comprise just one half of the alphabet, are never employed except in the roots or radical portions of words. The latter may also enter into the constitution of roots, but they are likewise put to the less independent use of the formation of derivatives and inflections, of prefixes and suffixes. The serviles are embraced in the

memorial words אֵיתָן מֹשֶׁה וְכָלֵב (Ethan Moses and Caleb); of these, besides other uses, איתן are prefixed to form the future of verbs, and the remainder are prefixed as particles to nouns. The letters הֶאֱמַנְתִּיו are used in the formation of nouns from their roots. The only exception to the division now stated is the substitution of ט for servile ת in a certain class of cases, as explained § 54. 4.

a. Kimchi in his Mikhlol (מִכְלוֹל) fol. 46, gives several additional anagrams of the serviles made out by different grammarians as aids to the memory, e.,g. שמלאכתו בינה *for his work is understanding;* אני שלמה כותב *I Solomon am writing;* שלומי אך תבנה *only build thou my peace;* משה כתב אלינו *like a branch of the father of multitude;* כשתיל אב המון *Moses has written to us.* To which Nordheimer has added שאל הון מכתבי *consult the riches of my book.*

§ 8. In Hebrew writing and printing, words are never divided. Hence various expedients are resorted to upon occasion, in manuscripts and old printed editions, to fill out the lines, such as giving a broad form to certain letters, א ה ד ל כ ת, occupying the vacant space with some letter, as ק, repeated as often as may be necessary, or with the first letters of the next word, which were not, however, accounted part of the text, as they were left without vowels, and the word was written in full at the beginning of the following line. The same end is accomplished more neatly in modern printing by judicious spacing.

§ 9. 1. The later Jews make frequent use of abbreviations. There are none, however, in the text of the Hebrew Bible; such as are found in the margin are explained in a special lexicon at the back of the editions in most common use, e. g. וגו for וְגוֹמֵר *et completio* = etc.

2. The numerical employment of the letters, common to the Hebrews with the Greeks, is indicated in the table of the alphabet. The hundreds from 500 to 900 are represented either by the five final letters or by the combination of ת with the letters immediately preceding; thus ך or תק 500, ם or תר 600, ן or תש or תרק 700, ף or תת 800, ץ or תתק 900. Thou-

sands are represented by units with two dots placed over them, thus אֿ 1000, etc. Compound numbers are formed by joining the appropriate units to the tens and hundreds, thus תכא 421. Fifteen is, however, made not by יה, which are the initial letters of the divine name Jehovah, יהוה, but by טו 9+6.

This use of the letters is found in the accessories of the Hebrew text, e. g. in the numeration of the chapters and verses, and in the Masoretic notes, but not in the text itself. Whether these or any other signs of number were ever employed by the original writers of Scripture, or by the scribes in copying it, may be a doubtful matter. It has been ingeniously conjectured, and with a show of plausibility, that some of the discrepancies of numbers in the Old Testament may be accounted for by assuming the existence of such a system of symbols, in which errors might more easily arise than in fully written words.

THE VOWELS.

§ 10. The letters now explained constitute the body of the Hebrew text. These are all that belonged to it in its original form, and so long as the language was a living one nothing more was necessary, for the reader could mentally supply the deficiencies of the notation from his familiarity with his native tongue. But when Hebrew ceased to be spoken the case was different; the knowledge of the true pronunciation could no longer be presumed, and difficulties would arise from the ambiguity of individual words and their doubtful relation to one another. It is the design of the Masoretic points (מְסוֹרָה *tradition*) to remedy or obviate these inconveniences by supplying what was lacking in this mode of writing. The authors of this system did not venture to make any change in the letters of the sacred text. The signs which they introduced were entirely supplementary, consisting of dots and marks about the text fixing its true pronun-

ciation and auxiliary to its proper interpretation. This has been done with the utmost nicety and minuteness, and with such evident accuracy and care as to make them reliable and efficient if not indispensable helps. These points or signs are of three kinds, 1. those representing the vowels, 2. those affecting the consonants, 3. those attached to words.

a. As illustrations of the ambiguity both as to sound and sense of individual words, when written by the letters only, it may be stated that דבר is in Gen. 12: 4 דִּבֶּר *he spake,* in Ex. 6: 29 דַּבֵּר *speak* and הֹבֵּר *speaking,* in Prov. 25: 11 דָּבֻר *spoken,* in Gen. 37: 14 דָּבָר *word,* in 1 Kin. 6: 16 דְּבִיר *the oracle* or most holy place of the temple, in Ex. 9: 3 דֶּבֶר *pestilence.* So וישק is in Gen. 29: 10 וַיַּשְׁק *and he watered,* and in the next verse וַיִּשַּׁק *and he kissed;* ויבא occurs twice in Gen. 29: 23, the first time it is וַיָּבֵא *and he brought,* the second וַיָּבֹא *and he came;* והשבתים is in Jer. 32: 37 first וַהֲשִׁבֹתִים *and I will bring them again,* and then וְהִשְׁבַּתִּים *and I will cause them to dwell;* שמים is in Gen. 14: 19 שָׁמַיִם *heaven,* and in Isa. 5 : 20 שָׂמִים *putting.* This ambiguity is, however, in most cases removed by the connection in which the words are found, so that there is little practical difficulty for one who is well acquainted with the language. Modern Hebrew is commonly written and read without the points: and the same is true of its kindred tongues the Syriac and Arabic, though each of these has a system of points additional to the letters.

§ 11. 1. The alphabet, as has been seen, consisted exclusively of consonants, since these were regarded as a sufficiently exact representation of the syllables into which in Hebrew they invariably enter. And the omission of the vowels occasioned less embarrassment, because in the Semitic family of languages generally, unlike the Indo-European, they form no part, properly speaking, of the radical structure of the word, and consequently do not aid in expressing its essential meaning, but only its nicer shades and modifications. Still some notation of vowels was always necessary, and this was furnished in a scanty measure by the vowel-letters, or, as they are also called, quiescents, or *matres lectionis* (guides in reading). The weakest of the palatals י was taken as the representative of the vowels *ī* and *ē* of the same organ to which in sound it bears a close affinity; the weakest of the labials ו was in like manner made to represent its cognates *ū* and *ō;* and the

two weak gutturals א and ה were written for the guttural
vowel *ā*, as well as for the compound vowels *ĕ* and *ŏ* cf which
a is one of the elements. Letters were more rarely employed
to represent short vowels; ה or י for *ĕ* is the most frequent
case; others are exceptional.

a. Medial *ā* when written at all, as it very rarely is, is denoted by א, e. g.
לאט *lāt* Judg. 4 : 21, דאג *dāg* Neh. 13 : 16 K'thibh, קאם *kām* Hos. 10 : 14,
עזאזל *ªzāzēl* Lev. 16 : 8, ראש *rāsh* Prov. 10 : 4 and in a few other passages,
ראמות sometimes for *rāmōth*, צואר *tsavvār*, אמאסאך Hos. 4 : 6 if not an
error in the text perhaps for *emāsāk;* final *ā*, which is much more frequent-
ly written, is denoted by ה, e. g. גלה *gālā*, מלכה *malkā*, אתה *attā*, rarely
and only as an Aramæism by א, e. g. חגא *hhoggā* Isa. 19 : 17, קרחא *korhhā*
Ezek. 27 : 31 K'thibh, גבהא *gābh'hā* Ezek. 31 : 5 K'thibh. The writing of
ē and *ī*, *ō* and *ū* is optional in the middle of words but necessary at the end,
e. g. צויתם or צויתרם *tsivvīthīm*, צויתי *tsivvīthī;* שבו or שובו *shūbhu*. In
the former position י stands for the first pair of vowels, and ו for the second,
e. g. מינקות *mēnīkōth*, נסוגתי *n'sūghōthī;* א for *ē* and *ō* so situated is rare
and exceptional, e. g. ראש *rēsh* Prov. 6 : 11, 30 : 8, and perhaps ינאץ *yānēts*
Eccles. 12 : 5; זאת *zōth*, פראת *pōrōth* Ezek. 31 : 8, בצאתו *bitstsōthāv* Ezek.
47 : 11. At the end of words *ē* is commonly expressed by י, and *ō* by ו,
though ה is frequently and א rarely employed for the same purpose, e. g.
מלכי *malkhē*, מלכו *malkō;* היה *h'yē*, פרעה *parō;* לא *lō*. Final *ĕ* is re-
presented by ה, medial *ĕ* if written at all by י, e. g. יהרה *yih'ye*, תהירנה or
תהרנה *tih'yenā*.

b. The employment of the vowel-letters in conformity with the scale
just given, is further governed, (1.) By usage, which is in many words and
forms almost or quite invariable; in others it fluctuates, thus *sōbhēbh* is
commonly סבב or סובב, only once סביב 2 Kin. 8 : 21; *yaªkōbh* is יעקב ex-
cept in Jer. 33 : 26 where it is יעקוב; *thēase* is תעשה, but in Ex. 25 : 31
תעישה; *ēthām* according to the analogy of similar grammatical forms would
be אתם, but in Ps. 19 : 14 it is איתם; *hēmīr* is in Jer. 2 : 11 written in both
the usual and an unusual way, המיר and הימיר; *m'lākhīm* is מלכים except
in 2 Sam. 11 : 1, where it is מלאכים; *g'bhūlōth* is in Deut. 32 : 8 גבלת, in
Isa. 10 : 13 גבולת, in Ps. 74 : 17 גבילות; *lō* meaning *not* is לא, meaning *to
him* is לו, though these are occasionally interchanged; *zō* is written both
זה and זו; and *pō* פה, פו and פא. (2.) The indisposition to multiply the
vowel-letters unduly in the same word, e. g. *ªlōªh* אלוה, *ªlōhīm* אלהים;
nāthūn נתון, *n'thūnīm* נתנים or נתונם. (3.) The increased tendency to their
employment in the later books of the Bible, e. g. כוח *kōªhh* Dan. 11 : 6,
always elsewhere כח; קודש *kōdhesh* Dan. 11 : 30, for קרש; דויד *dāvīdh* in
the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Zechariah, elsewhere com-
monly דוד. This must, however, be taken with considerable abatement,
as is shown by such examples as *addīrīm* אדירים Ex. 15 : 10, אדרם Ezek.
32 : 18.

It is to be observed that those cases in which א is used to record
vowels must be carefully distinguished from those in which it properly

belongs to the consonantal structure of the word, though from its weakness it may have lost its sound, as מָצָא *mātsā*, רִאשׁוֹן *rīshōn*. § 57, 2.

2. When used to represent the Hebrew vowels, *ā* is sounded as in *father*, *ă* as in *fat*, *ē* as in *there*, *ĕ* as in *met*, *ī* as in *machine*, *ĭ* as in *pin*, *ō* as in *note*, *ŏ* as in *not*, *ū* as in *rule*, and *ŭ* as in *full*. The quantity will be marked when the vowels are long, but not when they are short.

§ 12. There are nine points or masoretic signs representing vowels (תְּנוּעוֹת *motions*, viz., by which consonants are moved or pronounced); of these three are long, three short, and three doubtful. They are shown in the following table, the horizontal stroke indicating their position with reference to the letters of the text.

Long Vowels.				*Short Vowels.*			
קָמֶץ	Kā'-mets	*ā*	־ָ	פַּתָּח	Pát-tahh	*ă*	־ַ
צֵרִי	Tsē'-rē	*ē*	־ֵ	סֶגוֹל	Se'-ghōl	*ĕ*	־ֶ
חוֹלֶם	Hhō'-lem	*ō*	־ֹ	קָמֶץ חָטוּף	Kā'-mets Hhā-tūph'	*ŏ*	־ָ

Doubtful Vowels.

חִירֶק	Hhī'-rik	־ִ	*ī* or *ĭ*
שׁוּרֶק	Shū'-rek	־	} *ū* or *ŭ*
קֻבֶּץ	Kïb'-buts	־ֻ	

All these vowel-points are written under the letter after which they are pronounced except two, viz., Hholem and Shurek. Hholem is placed over the left edge of the letter to which it belongs, and is thus distinguished from the accent R'bhiᵃ, which is a dot over its centre. When followed by שׂ or preceded by שׂ it coincides with the diacritical point over the letter, e. g. מֹשֶׁה *mōshe*, שֹׂנֵא *sōnē;* when it follows שׁ or precedes שׁ it is written over its opposite arm.

e. g. שֹׁמֵר *shōmēr*, תִּרְפֹּשׁ *tirpōs*. Its presence in these cases must accordingly be determined by the circumstances. If preceded by a letter without a vowel-sign, שׁ will be *ōsh* and שׂ *ōs*; if it have itself no vowel-sign, שׂ will be *sō* and שׁ *shō*, except at the end of words. Shurek is a dot in the bosom of the letter Vav, thus וּ. It will be observed that there is a double notation of the vowel *u*. When there is a ו in the text this vowel, whether long or short, is indicated by a single dot within it, and called Shurek; in the absence of ו it is indicated by three dots placed obliquely beneath the letter to which it belongs, and called Kibbuts.

a. The division of the vowels given above differs from the common one into five long and five short, according to which Hhirik is counted as two, viz., Hhirik magnum ִי. = *ī*, and Hhirik parvum ִ = *ĭ*; and Shurek is reckoned a distinct vowel from Kibbuts, the former being *ū* and the latter *ŭ*. To this there are two objections. (1.) It confuses the masoretic signs with the letters of the text, as though they were coeval with them and formed part of the same primitive mode of writing, instead of being quite distinct in origin and character. The masoretic vowel-sign is not ִי. but ִ. The punctuators never introduced the letter י into the text; they found it already written precisely where it is at present, and all that they did was to add the point. And instead of using two signs for *i*, as they had done in the case of *a*, *e*, and *o*, they used but one, viz., a dot beneath the letter, whether *i* was long or short. The confusion of things thus separate in their nature was pardonable at a time when the **points** were supposed to be an original constituent of the sacred text, but not now when their more recent origin is universally admitted. (2.) It is inaccurate. The distinction between ִי. and ִ, וּ and ֻ, is not one of quantity, for *ī* and *ū* are expressed indifferently with or without Yodh and Vav.

Gesenius, in his Lehrgebäude, while he retains the division of the vowels into five long and five short, admits that it is erroneous and calculated to mislead; and it has been discarded by Rödiger in the latest editions of his smaller grammar. That which was proposed by Gesenius, however, as a substitute, is perplexed and obscure, and for this reason, if there were no others, is unfitted for the wants of pupils in the early stage of their progress. On the other hand, the triple arrangement here adopted after the example of Ewald, has the recommendation not only of clearness and correctness, but of being, instead of an innovation, a return to old opinions. The scheme of five long and five short vowels originated with Moses and David Kimchi, who were led to it by a comparison of the Latin and its derivatives. From them it was adopted by Reuchlin in his Rudimenta Hebraica, and thus became current among Christians. The Jewish grammarians, before the Kimchis, however, reckoned Kibbuts and Shurek as one vowel, Hhirik as one, and even Kamets and Kamets-

Hhatuph as one on account of the identity of the symbol employed to represent them. They thus made out seven vowels, the same number as in Greek, where the distinction into long, short and doubtful also prevails. That the literary impulses of the Orientals were chiefly received from the Greeks is well known; that the suggestion of a vowel-system came to the Syrians from this quarter is certain, both from direct testimony to this effect and from the shapes of their vowels, which still betray their origin. May not the Hebrews have learned something from the same school?

b. The names of the vowels, with the exception of Kamets-Hhatuph contain the sounds of the vowels which they are intended to represent, Kibbuts in the last, the others in their first syllable. Their signification is indicative either of the figure of the vowel or the mode of pronouncing it. Kamets and Kibbuts, *contraction*, i. e. of the mouth; Pattahh, *opening*; Tsere, *bursting forth*; Seghol, *cluster of grapes*; Hhirik, *gnashing*; Hholem, *strength*; Kamets-Hhatuph, *hurried Kamets*; Shurek, *whistling*. It is a curious circumstance that notwithstanding the diversity of the vowel-systems in the Syriac, Arabic, and Hebrew, the name Pattahh is common to them all.

§13. This later and more complete method of noting the vowels does not displace but is superinduced upon the scanty one previously described. Hence it comes to pass that such vowels as were indicated by letters in the first instance are now doubly written, i. e. both by letters and points. By this combination each of the two methods serves to illustrate and explain the other. Thus the added signs determine whether the letters אהוי (which have been formed into the technical word אֱהֶוִי *Eh^evī*) are in any given case to be regarded as vowels or as consonants. If these letters are themselves followed by a vowel or a Sh'va, §16, or have a Daghesh forte, §23, they retain their consonant sound; for two vowels never come together in Hebrew, and Sh'va and Daghesh forte belong only to consonants: thus קֹוֶיךָ *kōvekā*, מִצְוֹת *mitsvōth* (where צ being provided with a separate point, the Hholem must belong after ו), וְהָיָה *v'hāyā* קִיָּם *kiyyam*. Otherwise they quiesce in a preceding or accompanying vowel-sign, provided it is homogeneous with themselves; that is to say, they have the sound indicated by it, the vowel-sign merely interpreting what was originally denoted by the

letter. *E* and *i* are homogeneous to י, *o* and *u* to ו, and these being the only vowels which they were ever employed to represent, they can quiesce in no others; thus בִּי *bī*, מִי *nē*, גֵּרְא *gĕ*, בּוֹ *bō*, לוּ *lū*, but שֹׁרָי *sāray*, גּוֹי *gōy*, גָּלוּי *gāluy*, תָּו *tāv*, שָׁלֵו *shālēv*, זִו *zīv*; the combination יוְ is pronounced *āv*, עָנָיו and עָנָו *ānāv*, סְתִיו and סְתָו *s'thāv*. *A*, *e*, and *o* are homogeneous to א and ה. These letters deviate so far from the rule just given that א from its extreme weakness not only quiesces when it is properly a vowel-letter, but may give up its consonant sound and character after any vowel whatever, e. g. טָאטֵא *tītē*, רִאשׁוֹן *rīshōn*, פָּארָה *pūrā*; ה is never used as a vowel-letter except at the end of words, and there it always quiesces unless it receives a Mappik, §26.

a. As a letter was scarcely ever used to express *ŏ*, the quiescence of י in Kamets-Hhatuph is very rare, and where it does occur the margin always substitutes a reading without the ו, e. g. רְכוּנָה Jer. 27 : 20, הוּבְּנִים Ezek. 27 : 15, מִיּוֹרְדֵי־בֹור Ps. 30 : 4, סְגוּד־לֹּו Isa. 44 : 17, לְכוּל־ Jer. 33 : 8, וּגְדָיל־כֹּחַ Nah. 1 : 3. In אֲוּנִיוֹת 2 Chron. 8 : 18, and בָּמְיתֵי Deut. 32 : 13, ו represents or quiesces in the still briefer *ŏ* of Hhateph-Kamets, §16. 3.

b. In a few proper names medial ה quiesces at the end of the first member of the compound, e. g. פַּדָהצוּר Num. 1 : 10, עֲשָׂהאֵל 2 Sam. 2 : 19, also written עֲשָׂה־אֵל 1 Chron. 2 : 16. In such words as נוֹשְׁבָה Jer. 22 : 6, שֻׁפְּבָה Deut. 21 : 7, ה does not quiesce in Kibbuts, for the points belong to the marginal readings שפכו , נושבו § 46.

§14. On the other hand the vowel-letters shed light upon the stability of the vowels and the quantity of the doubtful signs. 1. As *ĭ* was scarcely ever and *ŭ* seldom represented by a vowel-letter, Hhirik with Yodh (יִ.) is almost invariably long and Shurek (וּ) commonly so. 2. The occasional absence in individual cases of the vowel-letters, does not determine the quantity of the signs for *i* and *u;* but their uniform absence in any particular words or forms makes it almost certain that the vowel is short. 3. The occasional presence of ו and י to represent one of their homogeneous long vowels proves nothing as to its character; but if in any

word or form these letters are regularly written, the vowel is, as a general rule, immutable. When ו and י stand for their long homogeneous vowels, these latter are said to be written fully, e. g. קוֹל *kōl*, נִיר *nīr*, מוּת *mūth;* without these quiescent letters they are said to be written defectively, e. g. וַהֲקִמֹתִי *haˌkīmōthī,* כָּמֹס *kāmūs.*

a. Hhirik with Yodh is short in וַהֲמִיתִיו *vahaˌmittīv* 1 Sam. 17:35, בִּיקְרוֹתֶיךָ *bikkˌrōthekhā* Ps. 45:10, לִיקְהַת־ *likkˌhath* Prov. 30:17. In צִיקְלַג 1 Chron. 12:1, 20, *i* is probably long, although the word is always elsewhere written without the Yodh; as it sometimes has a secondary accent on the first syllable and sometimes not (see 1 Sam. 30:1), it may have had a twofold pronunciation *tsīkˌlag,* and *tsiklag.* Shurek as *ŭ* is of much more frequent occurrence, e. g. חוּקֵּר *hhukkē,* לְאוּמִּים *lˌummīm,* חוּקָּה *hhukkā* Ps. 102:5, אַלְגּוּמִּים 2 Chron. 2:7, זוּפָּה Ezek. 16:34.

§15. The vowels may be further distinguished into pure, *a, i, u,* and diphthongal, *e, o ;* *e* being a combination of *a* and *i,* or intermediate between them, and *o* holding the same relation to *a* and *u.*

SH'VA.

§16. 1. The absence of a vowel is indicated by ְ Sh'vā (שְׁוָא *emptiness,* or as written by Chayug, the oldest of Jewish grammarians, שְׁבָא), which serves to assure the reader that one has not been inadvertently omitted. It is accordingly placed under all vowelless consonants except at the end of words, where it is regarded as unnecessary, the absence of a vowel being there a matter of course. If, however, the last letter of a word be ך, or if it be immediately preceded by another vowelless letter, or be doubled by the point called Daghesh-forte, § 23, Sh'va is written to preclude the doubt which is possible in these cases, e. g. מִשְׁמַרְכֶם, מַלְךְּ, קְשֹׁט, נָתַתְּ, אַתְּ, אָמַרְתְּ. Sh'va is not given to a quiescent letter, since it represents not a consonant but a vowel, e. g. הִינִיקָה, nor as a general rule to a final consonant preceded by a

quiescent; thus חַטָּאת, וּבָאת Ruth 3 : 4; וְהָלִית Isa. 62 : 3, though in this case it is sometimes written, e. g. וּבָאתָ 2 Sam. 14 : 3; וְהָלִיתָ 2 Sam. 14 : 2; וְהָלִיתָ Judg. 13 : 3; הוֹצֵאת 1 Kin. 11 : 13. א at the end of a word, preceded either by a vowelless letter or a quiescent, is termed otiant, and is left unpointed, e. g. הוּא רִבּוֹא וַיֵּרְא חֵטְא.

a. Final ך may receive Sh'va for the sake of distinction not only from ן, as already suggested, but also from ר with which it might be in danger of being confounded in manuscripts; Freytag conjectures that it is properly a part of the letter, like the stroke in the corresponding final ك in Arabic. In such forms as רַגְלָיו Sh'va is omitted with the closing letters because the י is not sounded.

2. Sh'va may be either silent (נָח *quiescens*), or vocal (נָע *mobile*). At the close of syllables it is silent. But at the beginning of a syllable the Hebrews always facilitated the pronunciation of concurrent consonants by the introduction of a hiatus or slight breathing between them; a Sh'va so situated is consequently said to be vocal, and has a sound approaching that of a hastily uttered *e*, as in *given*. This will be represented by an apostrophe, thus, בְּמִדְבַּר *b'midhbar*, פְּקַדְתֶּם *p'kadhtem*.

a. According to Kimchi (Mikhlol fol. 189) Sh'va was pronounced in three different ways, according to circumstances. (1.) Before a guttural it inclined to the sound of the following vowel, e. g. יְאַבֵּד *y*ᵃ*abbēdh*, שְׂאֵת *s*ᵉ*ēth*, דְּצוּ *d*ᵘ*ū*, and if accompanied by Methegh, § 44, it had the full sound of that vowel, e. g. שְׂאוּ *sūū*, תְּחִי *tīhhī*, לְצוֹלָם *lōōlām*. (2.) Before Yodh it inclined to *i*, e. g. בְּיַעֲקֹב *b*ⁱ*ya*ᵃ*kōbh*, כְּיוֹם *k*ⁱ*yōm*, and with Methegh was sounded as Hhirik, e. g. בְּיַד *biyadh*. (3.) Before any other letter it inclined to *a*, e. g. בְּרָכָה *b*ᵃ*rākhā*, גְּלִילִים *g*ᵃ*līlīm*, and with Methegh was pronounced as Pattahh בְּמַקְהֵלוֹת *bamakhēlōth*.

3. Sh'va may, again, be simple or compound. Sometimes, particularly when the first consonant is a guttural, which from its weakness is in danger of not being distinctly heard, the hiatus becomes still more audible, and is assimilated in sound to the short guttural vowel *ă*, or the diphthongal *ĕ* or *ŏ*, into which it enters. This assimilation is rep-

resented by combining the sign for Sh'va with those for the short vowels, thus forming what are called the compound Sh'vas in distinction from the simple Sh'va previously explained.

These are,

Hhātēph-Pattahh   ⫶ ;   thus, עֲמֹד   ^amōdh.

Hhātēph-Seghol   ⫶ ;   thus, אֱמֹר   ^emōr.

Hhātēph-Kamets   ⫶ ;   thus, חֳלִי   hh^olī.

a. Hhātēph (חָטֵף *snatching*) denotes the rapidity of utterance or the hurried character of the sounds represented by these symbols.

b. The compound Sh'vas, though for the most part restricted to the gutturals, are occasionally written under other consonants in place of simple Sh'va, to indicate more distinctly that it is vocal: thus, Hhateph-Pattahh וְזָהָב Gen. 2:12, הַבְרָכָה Gen. 27:38; Hhateph-Kamets לְקָחָה Gen. 2:23, אֶכְתֳּבֶנָּה Jer. 31:33; but never Hhateph-Seghol except צֶלְצְלִים 2 Sam. 6:5 in some editions, e. g. that of Stephanus. This is done with so little uniformity that the same word is differently written in this respect, e. g. בַּסְּעָרָה 2 Kin. 2:1, בַּסְעָרָה ver. 11.

PATTAHH FURTIVE.

§17. A similar hiatus or slight transition sound was used at the end of words in connection with the gutturals. When ע, ח, or the consonantal ה at the end of words is preceded by a long heterogeneous vowel (i. e. another than *a*), or is followed by another vowelless consonant, it receives a Pattahh furtive ⫶ , which resembles in sound an extremely short *a*, and is pronounced before the letter under which it is written, e. g. רוּחַ *rū^ahh*, שָׁמֹעַ *shāmō^a*, מַגְבִּיהַ *maghbī^ah*, שָׁמַעַתְּ *shāma^at*, יִחַדְּ *yi^ahhd*.

a. Some grammarians deny that Pattahh furtive can be found under a penultimate guttural, contending that the vowel-sign is in such cases a proper Pattahh, and that שָׁמַעַתְּ should accordingly be read *shāmaat*, and יִחַדְּ *yihhad*. But both the Sh'va under the final letter, §16, and the Daghesh-lene in it, § 21, show that the guttural is not followed by a vowel. The sign beneath it must consequently be Pattahh furtive, and represent an antecedent vowel-sound. In some manuscripts Pattahh furtive is written as Hhateph-Pattahh, or even as simple Sh'va; thus, רָקִיַע or רָקִיְע for רָקִיעַ.

SYLLABLES.

§18.   1. Syllables are formed by the combination of consonants and vowels.   As two vowels never come together in the same word in Hebrew without an intervening consonant, there can never be more than one vowel in the same syllable; and with the single exception of וּ occurring at the beginning of words, no syllable ever consists of a vowel alone.   Every syllable, with the exception just stated, must begin with a consonant, and may begin with two, but never with more than two.   Syllables ending with a vowel, whether represented by a quiescent letter or not, are called simple, e. g. לְךָ *l'khā*, עוֹלָה *ō-lā*.   (The first syllable of this second example begins, it will be perceived, with the consonant ע, though this disappears in the notation given of its sound.) Syllables ending with a consonant, or, as is possible at the close of a word, with two consonants, are said to be mixed: thus קְמַתֶּם *kam-tem*, הָלַכְתְּ *hā-lakht*.   As the vocal Sh'vas, whether simple or compound, are not vowels properly speaking, but simply involuntary transition sounds, they, with the consonants under which they stand, cannot form distinct syllables, but are attached to that of the following vowel. Pattahh furtive in like manner belongs to the syllable formed by the preceding vowel.   Thus זְרוֹעַ *z'rō*^{a}, אֲנִי ^{o}*nī* are monosyllables.

2. Long vowels always stand in simple syllables, and short vowels in mixed syllables, unless they be accented. But accented syllables, whether simple or mixed, may contain indifferently a long or a short vowel.

a. The following may serve as a specimen of the division of Hebrew words into their proper syllables; thus,

אָדָם	אֱלֹהִים	בָּרָא	בְּיוֹם	אָדָם	תּוֹלְדֹת	סֵפֶר	זֶה
ā-dhā′m	^{e}lō-hī′m	b'rō′	b'yō′m	ā-dhā′m	tō-l'dhō′th	sē′-pher	zĕ′

Gen. 5 : 1.

בִּדְמוּת	אֱלֹהִים	עָשָׂה	אֹתוֹ
bidh-mū′th	^{e}lō-hī′m	ā-sā′	ō-thō′

b. The reason of the rule for the quantity of syllables appears to be this. In consequence of their brevity, the short vowels required the addition of a following consonant to make the utterance full and complete, unless the want of this was compensated by the greater energy of pronunciation due to the accent. The long vowels were sufficiently complete without any such addition, though they were capable of receiving it under the new energy imparted by the accent. This pervading regularity, which is so striking a feature of the Hebrew language, was the foundation of the *systema morarum* advocated by some of the older grammarians of Holland and Germany. The idea of this was, that each syllable was equal to three *morae*, that is, three rests, or a bar of three beats; a long vowel being equivalent to two *morae*, or two beats, a short vowel to one, and the initial or final consonant or consonants also to one: thus קָטַלְתְּ k (1) $+ \bar{a}$ (2) $= 3$, t (1) $+ a$ (1) $+ lt$ (1) $= 3$. An accented syllable might have one *mora* or beat either more or less than the normal quantity. This system was not only proposed by way of grammatical explanation, but also made the basis of a peculiar theory of Hebrew prosody. See Gesenius, Geschichte d. Heb. Sprache, p. 123.

c. The cases in which short vowels occur in unaccented simple syllables, are all due to the disturbing influence exerted by the weak letters upon the normal forms of words; thus, הָאֵת *hă-ēth* is for הַאֵת, and יַהוּא *hă-hū'* for *hăh-hū*: such words as דֶּשֶׁא, פֶּרֶא, פֶּלֶא, הֵנֶּה, קֶצֶה are formed after the analogy of מֶלֶךְ. A long vowel in an unaccented mixed syllable is found in but one word, and that of foreign origin, בֵּלְשַׁאצַּר *bēl-t'shăts-tsái*, though here, as in the majority of instances falling under the previous remark, the syllable receives, if not the primary, yet the secondary accent, e. g. תֵּעָצֵם, הֶחָרִים, הַעִידֹתִי. The same is the case when a long vowel is retained before Makkeph, e. g. שֶׁת־לִּי. In the Arabic, which is exceedingly rich in vowels, there are comparatively few mixed syllables; nearly every consonant has its own vowel, and this more frequently short than long. The Chaldee, which is more sparing in its use of vowels than the Hebrew, observes in general the same rule with respect to the quantity of syllables, though not with the same inflexible consistency.

AMBIGUOUS SIGNS.

§19. It will now be possible, by aid of the principles already recited, to determine the quantity of the doubtful vowels, and to remove the ambiguity which appears to exist in certain vowel-signs.

1. Hhirik, Shurek, and Kibbuts, in unaccented simple syllables, must be long, and in unaccented mixed syllables, short, e. g. יִירַשׁ or יִרַשׁ *yī-rash,* יִבְנוּ *yibh-nū,* גְּבוּלוֹ or גְּבֻלּוֹ *g'bhū-lō,* יֵלֵד or יוּלַד *yul-ladh,* כֻּלָּם or כּוּלָּם *kul-lām,* מְעִידֵי

or מָעֻזִּי *māuzzī*. In accented syllables, whether simple or mixed, they are always long, e. g. שִׂיחָם or שִׂיחִים *sī-hīm*, לִי *lī*, גְּבוּל or גְּבֻל *g'bhūl*, דְּרָשֻׁהוּ or דְּרָשׁוּהוּ *d'rā-shū-hū*, the only exception being that Hhirik is short in the monosyllabic particles אִם, אֵשׁ, עִם, מִן, and in some abbreviated verbal forms of the class called Lamedh-He, e. g. וַיִּן, וַיִּשְׁבְּ, וַיִּרֶב.

The only cases of remaining doubt are those in which these vowels are followed by a letter with Sh'va, either simple or compound. If the former, it might be a question whether it was silent or vocal, and consequently whether the syllable was simple or mixed. If the latter, though the syllable is of course simple, the weak letter which follows may interfere with the operation of the law. Here the etymology must decide. The vowel is long or short as the grammatical form may require; thus in יִרְאֶה־לֹּו, תֵּהָלֵךְ, יֶחֱלֶה Gen. 22 : 8, which follow the analogy of יִקְטֹל, and in סְבְכִי Isa. 10 : 34, קְמָצֹ the first vowel is short; in יְשִׂימָהּ, גְּבֻלְכֶם the first vowel is long. In a few instances the grammatical form in which Hhirik is employed is itself doubtful; the distinction is then made by means of Methegh, §44, which is added to the vowel-sign if it is long, but not if it is short; thus, יִרְאוּ *yī-r'ū*, from יָרֵא *to fear*, and יִשְׁנוּ *yī-sh'nū* from יָשֵׁן *to sleep;* but יִרְאוּ *yir-ū* from רָאָה *to see*, and יִשְׁנוּ *yish-nū* from שָׁנָה *to do a second time.*

2. Kamets *ā* and Kamets-Hhatuph *ŏ* are both represented by the same sign (ָ), but may be distinguished by rules similar to those just given. In an unaccented simple syllable it is Kamets; in an unaccented mixed syllable it is Kamets-Hhatuph; in an accented syllable, whether simple or mixed it is Kamets, e. g. דָּבָר *dā-bhār*, חָפְשִׂי *hhoph-shī*, מָוֶת *mā-veth*, לָמָּה *lām-mā*, בָּתִּים *bot-tīm*. Before a letter with simple Sh'va, the distinction is mostly made by Methegh, §44; without Methegh it is always Kamets-Hhatuph, with it commonly Kamets, e. g. חָכְמָה *hhokh-mā*, חָכְמָה *hhā-kh'mā*. Before a guttural with Hhateph-Kamets or Kamets-Hhatuph

it is frequently ŏ, though standing in a simple syllable and accompanied by Methegh, e. g. בְּחָרִי *bo-ḥʰŏrī*, תְּעָבְדֵם *to-obhdhēm*. The surest criterion, however, and in many cases the only decisive one, is found in the etymology. If the vowel be derived from Hholem, or the grammatical form requires an *o* or a short vowel, it is Kamets-Hhatuph; but if it be derived from Pattahh, or the form requires an *a* or a long vowel, it is Kamets: thus וָאֳנִיּוֹת with the prefixed conjunction *voʾniyyōth*, הָאֳנִיָּה with the article *hāʾŏniyyā*; יָעֳמַד in the Hophal *yoʾmadh*, יְתָאֳרֵהוּ Isa. 44 : 13 in the Piel *y'thāʾrēhū*. The first vowel is ŏ in צָהֳרַיִם from צֹהַר, קָדָשִׁים from קֹדֶשׁ, שָׁרָשִׁים from שֹׁרֶשׁ, עֲשָׂקָה־לִּי Isa. 38 : 14, קָבָה־לִּי Num. 22 : 11, אָרָה־לִּי Num. 23 : 7 and the like, and the first two vowels in such words as פָּעֳלֶם from פֹּעַל, מָאֳסֶם Isa. 30 : 12 from מָאַס, קָרְבְּכֶם Deut. 20 : 2, קָטְבְּךָ Hos. 13 : 14, קָטְלִי 2 Chron. 10 : 10, קָבְל־עָם 2 Kin. 15 : 10, because they are shortened from Hholem. On the other hand the first vowel is *ā* in שָׁהֲדִי Job 16 : 19 from שָׁהֵד, חֲרָשִׁים from חָרָשׁ, בָּמָתֵי from בָּמָה, and in קָרַבְתָּ, מָאַסְתָּ and the like, because it is originally and properly Kamets. The word שָׁמְרָה is in Ps. 86 : 2 the imperative *shomrū*, in Job 10 : 12 the preterite *shām'rū*.

a. In a very few instances Kamets-Hhatuph is found in a syllable bearing a conjunctive accent, viz.: רָדְפִי Ps. 38 : 21, כָּל Ps. 35 : 10, also Prov. 19 : 7 (in some copies), and in the judgment of Ewald סָעֵד Judg. 19 : 5, comp. ver. 8 and עָב Ezek. 41 : 25; in Dan. 11 : 12 וְרָם the points belong to the marginal reading ורם, and the vowel is consequently Kamets. There are also a few cases in which Kamets remains in a mixed syllable, deprived of its accent by Makkeph, § 43, without receiving Methegh, viz.: מְנָת־ Ps. 16 : 5, קָרָב־ Ps. 55 : 19, 22, סְכָךְ־ Ps. 74 : 5; and a final unaccented Kamets is not affected by the insertion of Daghesh-forte conjunctive, § 24, in the initial letter of the following word, e. g. מָשַׁחְתָּ שָּׁם Gen. 31 : 13. When an accent takes the place of Methegh, it serves equally to distinguish *a* from ŏ, e. g. וְלָגְפוּ Ex. 21 : 22 *v'nāgh'phū*, וּמָכְרוּ Ex. 21 : 35 *ūmākh'rū*. § 45. 5.

b. Inasmuch as מָחֳרָת is derived from מָחָר *māhhār*, its first vowel might be suspected to be *ā*; but as it is so constantly written with Hhateph-Kamets, the preceding vowel is probably conformed to it. It is consequently regarded and pronounced as ŏ. Kimchi (Mikhlol, fol. 188) declares that the first vowel in הֶרְבָּן 1 Sam. 13 : 21, דָּרְבֹּנוֹת Eccles. 12 : 11

and גְּבְלֹתָיו Num. 24:7 was universally held to be Kamets, and that with the exception of Rabbi Jonah ben Gannach, who was of a contrary mind, the same unanimity prevailed in regard to the first vowel of קָרְבָּן Ezek. 40: 43. As, however, this last word is in every other place written without the Methegh, and there is no analogy for such words as those mentioned above having *ā* in their initial syllable, the best authorities are now agreed that the vowel is *ŏ*. and the words are accordingly read *dorbhān*, etc. In יָשְׁפֵה *jasper*, and בָּרְקַת *emerald*, Ezek. 28:13, which are mentioned by Kimchi in the same connection, the first vowel is Kamets.

c. In some manuscripts and a few of the older printed books, e. g. Stephanus' Hebrew Bible and Reuchlin's Rudimenta Hebraica, Kamets-Hhatuph is denoted by (־ֵ). It then differs from Kamets, but is liable to be confounded with Hhateph-Kamets. It can, however, be distinguishea from it by the circumstance that Kamets-Hhatuph is always followed either by simple Sh'va, Daghesh-forte, or Methegh ; none of which ever immediately succeed Hhateph-Kamets. Such a form as קָבְלּוֹ Ezek. 26:9 in the editions of Michaelis and Van der Hooght is an impossible one if (־ֵ) have its ordinary meaning.

d. It is surprising that in so minute and careful a system of orthography as that of the Masorites, there should be no symbol for *ŏ* distinct from that for *ā ;* and some have felt constrained in consequence to suppose that the signs for these two vowels were originally different, but became assimilated in the course of transcription. This seems unlikely, however. The probability is that *ā* and *ŏ*, whose resemblance even we can perceive, were so closely allied in the genuine Hebrew pronunciation, that one sign was thought sufficient to represent them. especially as the Masorites were intent simply on indicating sounds without concerning themselves with grammatical relations.

§ 20. 1. As simple Sh'va is vocal at the beginning of a syllable and silent at its close, there can be no doubt as to its character when it stands under initial or final letters. Preceding the first vowel of a word it must of course be vocal, and following the last vowel it must be silent, זְכַרְתָּם *z'khartām*, זָכַרְתְּ *zākhart*. In the middle of a word, the question whether it belongs to the syllable of the preceding or the following vowel must be determined by the circumstances. If a complete syllable precedes, that is, either an unaccented long vowel or a vowelless consonant serving as the complement of a previous short vowel, it is vocal. If it be preceded by a short vowel which cannot make a complete syllable without the aid of a following consonant, or by a long accented

vowel, it is silent: זָכְרֵי *zō-kh're,* תִּזְכְּרוּ *tiz-k'rū,* זִכְרוּ *zikh-ι ū,* תִּקְטֹלְנָה *tiktōl-nā.* Sh'va under a letter doubled by Daghesh forte, § 23, is vocal, such a letter being equivalent to two, the first of which completes the previous syllable, and the second begins the syllable which follows: הַזְּכָרִים = הַזְזְכָרִים *haz-z'khārīm.*

2. In addition to this it is to be remarked that Sh'va is vocal after what may be called intermediate syllables; that is to say, when the consonant under which it stands performs, as it occasionally does, the double office of completing one syllable and beginning the next. Thus, when it follows a consonant from which Daghesh-forte has been omitted, וַיְבַקְשׁוּ *vay'bhak'shū* for *vay-y'bhak-k'shū,* or the first of two similar letters, in order that the reduplication may be made more distinct, הַלְלוּ *hal'lū,* קִלְלַת *kil'lath,* צִלְלוֹ *tsil'lō,* אֲלְלַי *al'lay,* הִקְקֵי *hhik'ke,* and in several other cases, which will be more particularly described in § 22.

a. The same double office is performed by gutturals beginning one syllable and yet inclining to complete the one before it, § 18. 2. *c.* In הַעַת, for example, ע belongs in a measure to both syllables. It properly begins the second, and yet it is preceded by a short vowel just as if it ended the first, which is accordingly to be reckoned an intermediate syllable, being in strictness neither simple nor mixed, but partaking of the nature of both.

DAGHESH-LENE.

§ 21. The second class of signs added to the Hebrew text are those which are designed to guide in the pronunciation of the consonants. These are the diacritical point over Shin, Daghesh-lene, Daghesh-forte, Mappik, and Raphe. The use of the first of these has already been sufficiently explained, § 3. 1.

1. Daghesh-lene (דָּגֵשׁ קַל) is a point inserted in the six letters ב ג ד כ פ ת (technically called *B'ghadh K'phath*), to indicate the loss of their aspiration, e. g. ב *bh,* בּ *b,* etc.

As these letters are always aspirated after a vowel-sound, however slight, and never as an initial utterance or when following a consonant, they invariably require Daghesh-lene whenever they are not immediately preceded by a vowel or a vocal Sh'va. It is consequently inserted in the initial aspirate of a word which begins a verse, בְּרֵאשִׁית Gen. 1:1, or which follows a word bearing a disjunctive accent (inasmuch as this represents a pause of longer or shorter duration), וּבֵיתְךָ בָּאוּ Ex. 1:1, פֶּן ׀ עַתָּה Gen. 3:22, or ending in a consonant, מַצְלִיחַ דַּרְכִּי, אֶל־בְּנֵי Gen. 24:42; but not if it follows a word ending in a vowel and having a conjunctive accent, הָיְתָה תֹהוּ, פְּנֵי תְהוֹם Gen. 1:2. The sacred name יְהֹוָה is followed by Daghesh-lene, even though it may have a conjunctive accent, Num. 10:29, Deut. 3:26, Josh. 10:30, 11:8, Ps. 18:21, because in reading the Jews always substitute for it the word אֲדֹנָי, which ends in a consonant. In a very few cases, however, e. g. אֲדֹנָי בָּם Ps. 68:18, קְרָאֻחוּ Isa. 34:11, שָׁכַר בָּהּ Ezek. 23:42, Daghesh-lene is not inserted after a vowel-letter, which retains its consonant sound.

2. Daghesh-lene is inserted in a medial or final aspirate preceded by a vowelless consonant, whether this be accompanied by silent Sh'va or Pattahh furtive, e. g. שָׁמַעְתְּ, נִסְתַּרְתָּ; but not if it be preceded by a vowel or vocal Sh'va, whether simple or compound, e. g. עֲבָדְתֶּם, וּבְבֵית.

a. The primary signification of the name Daghesh is commonly explained from the Syriac ‍ (דְּגַשׁ), to which Castellus in his lexicon gives the sense of *piercing*. This is by some applied to the puncture or point which is its written sign, by others to its power of sharpening the sound of letters by removing their aspiration or doubling them. Buxtorf, however, in his Chaldee Lexicon, disputes the existence of such a root in either Syriac or Chaldee, alleging that in Prov. 12:18, the passage quoted to prove the word, the true reading is ‍ (רגשא). The six letters which receive Daghesh-lene in Hebrew have the same twofold pronunciation in Syriac, a red dot called Rukhokh (‍ *softness*), being written beneath them when they were to be aspirated, and another called Kushoi (‍ *hardness*), being written above them when they were not.

b. Grammarians are not agreed whether the aspirated or unaspirated sound of these consonants was the original one. There being no data for the settlement of the question, each decides it by his own theory of phonetic changes. The correctness of the Masoretic punctuation has sometimes been questioned in regard to this matter, on the ground of the improbability of such fluctuation in the sound of these letters in the same word. But besides the Syriac analogy just referred to, the Sanskrit language shows the almost unlimited extent to which euphonic changes may be carried by a people possessing a sensitive and discriminating ear. The Sanskrit aspirates, besides being subjected to other mutations which cannot here be detailed, regularly lose their aspiration when finals, and under certain conditions when medials, throwing it back, where this is possible, upon a previous letter. Bopp Kritische Grammatik, pp. 30. 42. Similar laws prevail to some extent in Greek, e. g. θρίξ, τριχός; τρέφω, θρέψω; θύω, ἐτύθην; οὐκ ἔχω, οὐχ ἕξω; μεθ᾽ ὑμῖν.

§ 22. The absence of Daghesh-lene in an aspirate sometimes shows a preceding simple Sh'va to be vocal when this would not otherwise have been known. In most of the cases referred to, a letter originally belonging to the succeeding syllable is by the prefixing of a short vowel drawn back to complete the syllable before it; instead, however, of giving up its previous connection altogether, it forms an intermediate syllable, § 20. 2, the Sh'va remaining vocal though the antecedent vowel is short; thus, לְבַב *l'bhabh* with the prefix בְּ becomes בִּלְבַב *bil'bhabh*, not בִּלְבַב *bil-babh*.

a. The particular instances in which this may occur are the following, viz.: (1) The Kal imperative of verbs and the Kal infinitive with suffixes, e. g. עָבְדֵנוּ, עָבְדָם, עָבְדוֹ, עִבְדוּ from עֲבֹד; yet with occasional exceptions, as בְּאָסְפְּכֶם Lev. 23 : 39. (2) Those forms of Pe Guttural verbs in which the first radical assumes a short vowel in place of the silent Sh'va in the regular inflexion, e. g. תֶּעָבְדֵם, יַעֲבְדוּ for תֵּעָבְדֵם, יַעֲבְדוּ. (3) The construct plural of nouns חֻרְבוֹת from חֳרָבוֹת, כְּתֻפּוֹת from כְּתֵפוֹת, עַבְדֵי from עֲבָדִים, though with occasional exceptions, as רִשְׁפֵּי Cant. 8 : 6, but רְשָׁפֶּיהָ Ps. 76 : 4, צִמְדֵּי Isa. 5 : 10, חֶרְפּוֹת Ps. 69 : 10, בִּרְכֵי Gen. 50 : 23, but בִּרְכֵּיהֶם Judg. 7 : 6; בִּגְדֵי, בִּגְדוֹ from בֶּגֶד are peculiar in omitting Daghesh in the singular with suffixes. (4) Three feminine nouns ending in וּת, מַלְכוּת from מֶלֶךְ, יַלְדוּת from יֶלֶד, עַבְדוּת (only occurring with suffixes) from עֶבֶד, but not מַרְדּוּת. Also a few other nouns of different forms, viz.: שִׁפְכָה, רִבְכָתִי but רִבְכְתַיִם, קָדְעָם Josh. 15 : 38, קַדְעָם Josh. 15 : 56. (5) After prefixes, as He interrogative, e. g. הֲיָדַעְתֶּם Gen. 29 : 5 from רְעָעְתֶּם, and inseparable prepositions, e. g. לִדְבִיר from דְּבִיר, בְּדַגַּת from דָּגַת, כִּדְבַר from דְּבַר. Usage is not uniform in the case of Kal infinitives follow-

ing inseparable prepositions, e. g. בִּכְתֹב ,לִכְתֹּב ;בִּנְפֹּל ,כִּנְפֹל ,לִנְפֹּל ;לְצָבָא
Isa. 31 : 4, לִצְבֹּא Num. 4 : 23, 8 : 24; כִּפְדֹּת ,לִפְדֹּת ,כִּזְבֹּר. (6) The suffixes of the
second person בֶּם ,כֶן ,ךָ never receive Daghesh-lene, בִּנְךָ ,בְּקַרְבְּכֶם.

These rules are sometimes of importance in etymology; thus, עִזְבוֹנַיִךְ
Ezek. 27 : 12 must have as its ground form עִזָּבוֹן, not עִזְבוֹן; and אֶרְבָּם
Hos. 7 : 6, רָהְבָּם Ps. 90 : 10 cannot be infinitives with suffixes, but must be
from the segholates רֹהַב ,אֹרֶב.

b. The omission of Daghesh-lene in the final letter of תּוֹסְףְּ Prov. 30 : 6,
abbreviated from תּוֹסִיף or תּוֹסֵף, is exceptional. The Daghesh occasion-
ally occurring in initial aspirates after words ending in a vowel and having
a conjunctive accent, is best explained not as an exception to the ordinary
rules, but as Daghesh forte conjunctive, § 24, e. g. אַרְצָה כְּנַעַן Gen. 11 : 31
and elsewhere, אַרְצָה גֹּשֶׁן Gen. 46 : 28, גָּאֹה גָּאָה Ex. 15 : 1. 21, זוּ גָּאָלְתָּ Ex.
15 : 13, וְעָשִׂיתָ פֶּסַח Deut. 16 : 1 (comp. עָשִׂית לָּנוּ Gen. 20 : 9), וְאָעִירָה בָּם
Deut. 31 : 28 (comp. וְאָעִירָה לִּי Isa. 8 : 2), וַיְהִי כְּכַלּוֹת Josh. 8 : 24, 10 : 20,
עָלְיָה פָּרֶץ Gen. 35 : 29, נָשְׁבָה בּוֹ Isa. 40 : 7. See also Gen. 39 : 12, Ex. 14 :
4. 17, Isa. 10 : 9, Job 9 : 2. Ex. 15 : 11. 16, Ps. 35 : 10, Isa. 54 : 12, Jer. 20 : 9,
Dan. 3 : 3. 5 : 11. The old strife as to the Daghesh in the word שְׁתַּיִם *two*
is not yet settled. Kimchi explained it as Daghesh-lene upon the suppo-
sition that the word was abridged from אֶשְׁתַּיִם; Schultens as Daghesh-
forte arising from an assimilated נ, contending that it was for שְׁתַּיִם from
שִׁנְתַּיִם; Nordheimer as an anomalous Daghesh-lene, introduced as a
euphonic expedient to prevent the combination of an aspirated ת with a
sibilant, such as is obviated in the Hithpael of verbs by a transposition
that would here be inadmissible. The puzzle is still further perplexed by
the circumstance that it once appears with the preposition מִן without the
Daghesh, מִשְּׁתֵּי Judg. 16 : 28, and again with the same preposition with it,
מִשְּׁתַּיִם Jon. 4 : 11, the Methegh showing the Sh'va to be vocal, as might
also be inferred from the fact that Daghesh-forte has been omitted.

DAGHESH-FORTE.

§ 23. 1. When the same consonant was repeated with a
vowel or even the slightest hiatus intervening, so that suc-
cessive movements of the organs of speech were required in
the pronunciation, the Hebrews invariably wrote the letter
twice. When, however, there was no interval between the
reduplicated consonants, and the only audible result was a
more protracted or vehement utterance of the same sound
effected by a single effort of the organs, the letter was written
but once. This fact the Masoretic punctuators have indi-
cated by placing a point called Daghesh-forte (דָּגֵשׁ חָזָק) in
the bosom of a letter so affected, to show that it is to be

doubled in the pronunciation; thus, וַיִּמֹּל *vayyimmāl*. Da-
ghesh-forte may be found in any letter with the exception
of the gutturals א ה ח ע, which on account of their weak
ness do not admit of reduplication. The letter ר, par-
taking of this with other peculiarities of the gutturals, re-
ceives it only in a very few exceptional cases, e. g. שֵׁרָאשִׁי,
מָרַּת.

2. The aspirates, when doubled, always at the same time
lose their aspiration; thus, יִפָּקֵד *yippākēdh*. Daghesh-forte
in these letters is readily distinguishable from Daghesh-lene
by the consideration that a consonant cannot be pronounced
double except after a vowel. A point in one of the aspirates
is, therefore, Daghesh-forte if a vowel precedes, otherwise it
is Daghesh-lene.

3. Daghesh-forte in ו may be distinguished from Shurek
in the same way. Inasmuch as two vowels cannot come to-
gether in the same word, if a vowel precedes it is Daghesh-
forte, if not it is Shurek.

a. Some Grammarians speak of Daghesh-forte *implicitum* in the gut-
turals, by which they mean that these letters appear in certain cases to
complete a foregoing syllable as well as to begin that in which they prop-
erly stand, in spite of the omission of Daghesh, which analogy would re-
quire them to receive. As these are included under what have already,
§ 20. 2. *a*, been explained as intermediate syllables, it is not thought neces-
sary to employ an additional term.

b. The Arabs have a sign of reduplication, Teshdid (◡), which is
written above the doubled letter. The Syrians have no written sign for
this purpose, and it is disputed whether their letters were ever doubled in
pronunciation. According to Asseman Biblioth. Orient. III. 2. p. 379, the
Western differed from the Eastern Syrians in this respect, "Occidentales
nullibi literas geminant."

§ 24. Different epithets have been applied to Daghesh-
forte to describe its various uses or the occasions of its em-
ployment. 1. When separate letters, whether originally
alike, or made so by assimilation, are by the inflection or
formation of words brought into juxtaposition, the Daghesh-

forte which represents such a doubling is called compensative; e. g. כָּרַתִּי, formed by appending the syllable תִּי to the root כָּרַת; נָתַתִּי composed of the same syllable and the root נָתַן, whose last letter is changed to ת to conform with that which follows; סֹבִּי from סָבַב. 2. When the reduplication is indicative of a particular grammatical form the Daghesh-forte is called characteristic, e. g. in the Piel, Pual, and Hithpael of verbs; as, הִלֵּךְ, הִתְהַלֵּךְ, and certain forms of nouns, as, גִּבּוֹר. 3. When it has arisen from the necessity of converting a previous simple syllable into a mixed one in order to preserve the quantity of a short vowel which it contains, it is Daghesh-forte conservative; e. g. יַסֹּב for יִסֹּב. 4. When the initial letter of a word is doubled under the influence of the final vowel of the word preceding, it is Daghesh-forte conjunctive; e. g. קוּמוּ צְּאוּ, יְהִי־לְּךָ, מַה־זֶּה. 5. When the last letter of an intermediate syllable is doubled in order to make the following hiatus or vocal Sh'va more distinct, it is Daghesh-forte dirimens or separative, because the letter which receives it is thus separated in part from the syllable to which it belongs; e. g. עִנְּבֵי *inn'bhē* for עִנְבֵי *in'bhē*. 6. When the first letter of a final syllable is doubled under the influence of a previous vowel bearing the accent (mostly a pause accent, § 36. 2. *a.*), for the sake of increased fullness and force of pronunciation, it is Daghesh-forte emphatic; e. g. חָדֵּלּוּ for חָדֵלוּ. In the first three uses named above Daghesh-forte is said to be essential, in the last three it is euphonic.

a. Daghesh-forte conjunctive occurs regularly after the pronoun מַה, e. g. מַה טּוֹב וּמַה־נָּעִים Ps. 133:1, and in a multitude of cases after final Kamets or Seghol in words accented on the penult or followed by Makkeph, § 43, e. g. לָקְחָה־זֹּאת Gen. 2:23, אָכַלְתָּ־שָּׁם Deut. 27:7, וְהָיְתָה לּוֹ Num. 25:13, עָנְתָה־בִּי Gen. 30:33; זֶה־יַּחֵל Num. 34:6, 7, 9, מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר Ex. 13:1 (where the accent is on the ultimate), מַעֲנֶה־לָּךְ Prov. 15:1 (in some editions), more rarely after other vowels, e. g. קוּמוּ צְּאוּ Gen. 19:14, לֹא וַיֹּאמְרוּ 1 Sam. 8:19, once after the liquid ר, e. g. לֹא וַיֹּאמֶר 1 Kin. 11:22. See also § 22. *b.* In a few instances words thus united are written as one, e. g. מַזֶּה Ex. 4:2 for מַה זֶּה, so מַּלָּכֶם Isa. 3:15, מַתְלָאָה Mal. 1:13, בְּאַסְפָּה

Isa. 27 : 8, and possibly אֶרְאֶלָּם Isa. 33 : 7. See Dr. Alexander's Com-mentary upon this passage.

b. Daghesh-forte separative occurs only in the following examples:

אֶפְרֶהָ	Hos. 3 : 2.	יִקְּרֶךָ	1 Sam. 28 : 10.	סֻבְּלוֹ	Isa. 9 : 3, 10 : 27.
בִּיקְרוֹתֶיךָ	Ps. 45 : 10.	כְּמַתּוֹחֲכֶנָה (?)	Ezek. 13 : 20.	עִנְּבֵי	Deut. 32 : 32.
הַזְּבָחִים	Am. 5 : 25.	מִנְּלוֹתְךָ	Isa. 33 : 1.	עִנִּתִי	2 Sam. 23 : 27, Jer. 29 : 27.
הִכְּצַעֲקָתָהּ	Gen. 18 : 21.	מִסְתָּרוֹ or מִסֶּתָרוֹ	Ps. 89 : 45.	עַצְּבֵיכֶם	Isa. 58 : 3.
הַכְּתֹנֶת	Gen. 37 : 32.	מַמְּגֻרוֹת	Joel 1 : 17.	עַצְּרֹתֵיכֶם	Am. 5 : 21.
הַלְּבֶּן	Gen. 17 : 17.	מַמְּרֹרִים	Job 9 : 18.	עִקְּבֵי (?)	Cant. 1 : 8.
הִרְאִיתֶם	1 Sam. 10 : 24, 17 : 25, 2 Kin. 6 : 32.	מִנְּזָרַיִךְ	Nah. 3 : 17.	עִקְּבוֹת	Ps. 89 : 52.
הַמְּרוֹתָם	Job 17 : 2.	מִקְּדָשׁ	Ex. 15 : 17.	עִקְּבוֹתֶיךָ	Ps. 77 : 20.
הַצְּפִינוֹ	Ex. 2 : 3.	מִקְּרֵה	Deut. 23 : 11.	עִשְּׂבוֹת	Prov. 27 : 25.
הִרְדִּיפֻהוּ (?)	Judg. 20 : 43.	נִכְּאוּ	Job 30 : 8.	צִמְּתַתְנִי	Ps. 119 : 139.
הִרְעִמָהּ	1 Sam. 1 : 6.	נִצְּרָה	Ps. 141 : 3.	צִמְּתָתוּנִי	Ps. 88 : 17.
הַלְּקֵר	Isa. 57 : 6.	נִצְּרָהָ	Prov. 4 : 13.	קַשְּׁתוֹתָם (?)	Ps. 37 : 15. Isa. 5 : 28.
יִקְּהַת	Gen. 49 : 10.	נְתַקְּנוּהוּ	Judg. 20 : 32.	שֻׁבְּלֵי	Zech. 4 : 12.
לִיקְּהַת	Prov. 30 : 17.	סַבְּכוּ	Jer. 4 : 7.	שִׁבֲּלוּל	Ps. 58 : 9.

This list is corrected and enlarged from Gesen. Lehrg. pp. 86 ff. Those words which are followed by a note of interrogation (?) are found in some editions but not in others. Daghesh separative may be found after He interrogative in some instances not included in the above list.

c. Daghesh-forte emphatic occurs only in חָדְלוּ Judg. 5 : 7, 1 Sam. 2 : 5; וַיֶּחֱלוּ Job 29 : 21; יֶחָתּוּ or יֵחַתּוּ Job 21 : 13; רִצַּתּוּ Isa. 33 : 12, Jer. 51 : 58; מִלְּשָׁה Ezek. 21 : 15; נָקֹשּׁוּ Ezek. 6 : 9; נָשַּׁתָּה Jer. 51 : 30; נָתְּנוּ Ezek. 27 : 19; קָמֵלּוּ (?) Isa. 19 : 6; and probably תְּהָתֵלּוּ Job 13 : 9 (not in pause).

§ 25. In order to the distinct utterance of a reduplicated consonant, it must be followed as well as preceded by a vowel-sound. Daghesh-forte is consequently never written in a final vowelless letter, with the exception of the two words אַתְּ , נָתַתְּ , both of which end in aspirates whose pronunciation would be changed by the removal of the Daghesh. In every other instance the doubling is neglected, even though the letter be an aspirate, which will for this reason resume its aspiration; e. g. קַל , קָלּוּ ; סֹב , סֹבִּי ; וַיִּהַד abridged from וַיִּהְדַּף ; וַיִּצַף from וַיְצַפֶּה . In a medial letter with Sh'va Daghesh may be written, because the Sh'va being thus rendered vocal the reduplication can be made audible by means

of the hiatus which it represents; it is, however, quite as frequently omitted, the Sh'va commonly remaining vocal as if it were inserted, and compound Sh'va being occasionally substituted for simple to indicate this fact, § 16. 3. *b.*; e. g. עוְֹרִים for עֹוְרִים, כְּסֹאוֹ for כִּסֹאוֹ, particularly after prefixes, as Vav conversive, the article and preposition מִ, so הַמְבַקֵּשׁ, וַיְהִי. It is seldom omitted from a medial aspirate on account of the change in its sound involved: yet even this is done occasionally, e. g. מִבְצִיר Judg. 8 : 2 for מִבְצָיר, תִּתְצוּ Isa. 22 : 10 for זְכָרוֹן, תִּתְצוּ from זִכָּרוֹן. In a few rare instances it is dropped from a letter followed by a vowel, when the laws of syllables will permit and the pronunciation will not be materially affected; e. g. תֵּעָגֵנָה Ruth 1 : 13 for תֵּעָגֵנָה.

MAPPIK.

§ 26. Mappīk (מַפִּיק *bringing out* or *uttering*), is a point in one of the letters י ו ה א, showing that it represents a consonant and not a vowel, or in other words that it does not quiesce in the preceding vowel-sign. It is unnecessary, however, to employ any notation for this purpose in the case of א ו and י, for their quiescence can be readily determined in all cases by the rules already given, § 13. Although it is much more extensively used in manuscripts, therefore, Mappik is in modern editions of the Hebrew Bible only inserted in final ה when it retains its consonantal power; e. g. אַרְצָהּ *artsāh,* אַרְצָה *artsā,* לְקָחָהּ *l'kāhhāh,* לְקָחָה *lāk'hhā.* The point four times found in א, וַיָּבִיאוּ Gen. 43 : 26, Ezra 8 : 18, תָּבִיאוּ Lev. 23 : 17, רָאוּ Job 33 : 21, though called a Daghesh in the Masoretic notes in the margin, is probably to be regarded as Mappik.

RAPHE.

§ 27. Rāphe (רָפֶה *weak*), is a small horizontal stroke placed over a letter, and denotes the opposite of Daghesh·

lene, Daghesh-forte, or Mappik, as the case may be.   As no inconvenience can arise from its omission, it is only occasionally used in modern Bibles, and not with entire uniformity in the different editions.   It is chiefly found where a Mappik has been omitted in ה, which according to analogy might be expected to be inserted, e. g. הַגְּסְדָּה Ex. 9:18, וּשְׂעָרָה Lev. 13:4, בְּחֶטְאָה Num. 15:28, לָהּ Num. 32:42, מִשִּׂכְמָה Job 31:22 in some copies.   In תַעֲשֶׂה־לְּךָ Ex. 20:4, Deut. 5:8, it is the opposite of Daghesh-forte, and shows that ל may either be doubled agreeably to the point in its bosom or not.   In לֹא תִּרְצָח Ex. 20:13, Deut. 5:17, it is the opposite of Daghesh-lene, and shows that the ת may either have its unaspirated sound, as the Daghesh indicates, or may be aspirated.   It is often referred to in the marginal Masoretic notes even where it is no longer found in the text, e. g. Judg. 16:16, 28.

ACCENTS

§ 28. The third class of Masoretic additions to the text are those which relate to the words.   These are the accents, Makkeph, Methegh, and the K'ri.   An accent (טַעַם) is written upon every word with a twofold design, 1st, of marking its tone-syllable, and 2dly, of indicating its relation to other words in the sentence.   The great number of the accents has respect entirely to this second function, there being no difference in the quality of the stress laid upon particular syllables, such for example as is marked by the Greek acute, grave, and circumflex, but only that difference in its amount which arises from the unequal emphasis naturally laid upon the different members of a clause or period.   The punctuators have attempted not only to indicate the pauses to be made in reading, as is done by the stops in use in other languages, but to represent to the eye the precise position held

by each word in the structure of the sentence, and the various grades of attraction or repulsion arising from the relations whether co-ordinate or subordinate which subsist among them.   Every sentence is fancifully regarded as a territory, which, partitioned into its several clauses, forms empires, kingdoms, and principalities, ruled by their respective sovereigns, each of whom has his own train of inferiors and dependants.   The accents are accordingly divided into Disjunctives or Rulers (מְלָכִים), and Conjunctives or Servants (עֲבָדִים).   The former indicate that the word upon which they are placed is more or less separated from those that follow; they mark thus the end of a clause or of the section of a clause over which they exert control.   The latter indicate that the word over or under which they are written is connected with what follows and belongs to the clause or section ruled by the next succeeding Disjunctive.

   a. The stress of voice denoted by the accent must not be confounded with quantity. An accented syllable may nevertheless be short, the energy with which it is pronounced not necessarily affecting its length.

   b. The Jews made use of the accents as musical notes in the cantillation of the synagogue, whence they are also called נְגִינוֹת. In the judgment of some this is a part, and perhaps a leading part, of their original design. Their great variety, the frequent occurrence of accents of opposite powers upon the same word, and the distinct system of poetical accents, favor this opinion. Such as are curious to know the details may find the mode of their employment for this purpose explained at length in Bartoloccii Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica, vol. iv. pp. 427–444.

   § 29. The Disjunctive accents may be divided into four classes of various rank or power, as follows, viz:

<div align="center">

CLASS I. *Emperors.*

</div>

*1.	Sillûk	(ֽ)	סִלּוּק׃
*2.	Athnahh	(֑)	אַתְנָח

CLASS II. *Kings.*

3.	S'ghōlta	(֒)	סְגֹלְתָּא	*postp.*
4.	Zākēph Kātōn	(֔)	זָקֵף קָטֹון	
5.	Zākēph Gādhōl	(֕)	זָקֵף גָּדֹול	
*6.	Tiphhhā	(֖)	טִפְחָא	

CLASS III. *Lukes.*

*7.	R'bhī⁺	(֗)	רְבִיַﬠ	
*8.	Shalsheleth	(֓)	שַׁלְשֶׁלֶת	
*9.	Zarkā	(~)	זַרְקָא	*postp.*
10.	Pashta	(֙)	פַּשְׁטָא	*postp.*
11.	Y'thībh	(֚)	יְתִיב	*prep.*
12.	T'bhīr	(֛)	תְּבִיר	

CLASS IV. *Counts.*

*13.	Pāzēr	(֡)	פָּזֵר	
14.	Karnē Phārā	(֟)	קַרְנֵי פָרָה	
15.	T'līshā Gh'dhōlā	(֠)	תְּלִישָׁא גְדוֹלָה	*prep.*
16.	Geresh	(֜)	גֶּרֶשׁ	
17.	G'rāshayim	(֞)	גְּרָשַׁיִם	
*18.	P'sīk	(׀)	פְּסִיק׀	

The Conjunctive accents, or *Servants*, are the following, viz :

*19.	Merkā	(֥)	מֵרְכָא	
*20.	Mūnāhh	(֣)	מוּנַח	
21.	Merkā Kh'phūla	(֦)	מֵרְכָא כְפוּלָה	
*22.	Mahpakh	(֤)	מַהְפַּךְ	
23.	Dargā	(֧)	דַּרְגָּא	
*24.	Kadhmā	(֨)	קַדְמָא	
*25.	Yerahh ben Yōmō	(֪)	יֶרַח בֶּן־יוֹמֹו	
26.	T'līshā K'tannā	(֩)	תְּלִישָׁא קְטַנָּה	*postp.*

a. Merka Kh'phula has sometimes been reckoned among the Disjunctives, as by Gesenius in his Lehrgebäude; but the absence of Daghesh-lene in the word following that on which it stands in Ex. 5:15, Ezek. 14:4, proves that it is a Conjunctive.

b. According to their most probable significations, the names of the accents appear to be in part borrowed from their forms and in part from their uses. Thus the Disjunctives: Silluk, *end;* Athnahh, *rest;* Segholta, *bunch of grapes;* Zakeph, small and great, *causing suspension;* Tiphhha, *palm of the hand;* R'bhiª, *square* or *reposing;* Shalsheleth, *chain;* Zarka, *dispersion;* Pashta, *expansion* or *letting down* (the voice); Y'thibh, *sitting still;* T'bhir, *interruption;* Pazer, *separator;* Karne Phara, *a heifer's horns;* T'lisha, great and small, *shield;* Geresh, *expulsion;* G'rashayim, *double Geresh;* P'sik, *cut off.* Conjunctives: Merka, *prolonging;* Munahh, (a trumpet) *at rest,* i. e., in its proper position; Merka Kh'phula, *double Merka;* Mahpakh, (a trumpet) *inverted;* Darga, *progress;* Kadhma, *beginning;* Yerahh ben-Yomo, *moon a day old.*

Other names are given to some of these accents, particularly where they occur in certain situations or combinations; thus Tiphhha is also called Tarhhā (טַרְחָא), Munahh with P'sik is called L'gharmēh (לְגַרְמֵהּ), etc.

c. The classification of the Disjunctives, according to their respective powers and the laws of their consecution, has been the work of Christian writers, from whom all accurate investigations of the accentual system have proceeded. In fact, this whole subject is treated by the Jewish grammarians in the crudest and most perplexed manner. Buxtorf says, in his Thesaurus Grammaticus, p. 45: Accentuum ratio hactenus nec a quoquam nostrorum nec ab ipsis etiam Hebraeis sufficienter explicata est. The division exhibited above is the one now commonly adopted. The current names, Imperatores, Reges, Duces, Comites, are those used by Wasmuth in his Institutio Accent. Heb. 1664. Others have divided them differently. The learned Pfeiffer, author of the Dubià Vexata, distinguishes one Emperor, one Archduke, four Dukes, seven Counts, and five Barons. Boston, the well-known author of the Fourfold State, in an elaborate Latin treatise upon this subject left by him in manuscript and published shortly after his death, distributes them into three classes of superior and one of inferior rank. Mention is made, in a commendatory preface by Mill, the distinguished critic of the New Testament, of another manuscript in English, in which Boston applied his views practically in a twofold translation of the first twenty-three chapters of Genesis, with copious notes, both philological and theological. This, it is believed, has never been published. A curious little book upon the Canon by Ferdinand Parkhurst, London, 1660, makes six Regal and ten Principial Disjunctives Y'thibh and P'sik being omitted altogether.

§ 30. 1. Fourteen of the accents are written over, and eleven under, the words to which they are attached. P'sik, whose only use is to modify the power of other accents, is written after the word to which it belongs, and in the same line

with it. The place of the accents is either over or under the letter preceding the tone-vowel, with the exception of the prepositives Y'thibh and T'lisha Gh'dhola, which always accompany the initial letter of the word, and the postpositives S'gholta, Zarka, Pashta, and T'lisha K'tanna, which stand upon the final letter. Y'thibh is only used when the first is the tone-syllable. Pashta is repeated if the word on which it stands is accented on the penult, e. g. תֹּהוּ Gen. 1 : 2, or ends with two vowelless letters, e. g. וַתִּשְׁכְּ Ruth 3 : 7, or if the last letter has Pattahh furtive, e. g. יֹדֵעַ Gen. 33 : 13, and in some manuscripts and editions there is a like repetition of S'gholta and Zarka. When a word bears the other prepositive or postpositives, there is nothing to mark its tone-syllable unless this may chance to be the one upon which the nature of the accent in question requires it to be placed.

2. Silluk has the same form as Methegh, § 44; but the former invariably stands on the tone-syllable of the last word in the verse, while Methegh is never written under a tone-syllable. Pashta is likewise distinguished from Kadhma only by its position upon the last letter of the word, and after the superscribed vowel, if there be one, e. g. אֲשֶׁר Gen. 1 : 7, מַלְאָכוֹ Gen. 24 : 7, while Kadhma is placed upon the letter preceding the tone-vowel, e. g. אֲשֶׁר Gen. 2 : 19 : where this chances to be a final letter the laws of consecution only can decide; thus, in זַרְעֶךָ Gen. 26 : 4, צֵאתְךָ Deut. 16 : 3, the accent is Pashta, but in וּלְזַרְעֶךָ Gen. 17 : 8, צֵאתְךָ 1 Sam. 29 : 6, it is Kadhma. Y'thibh is distinguished from Mahpakh by being written under the first letter of the word and taking precedence of its vowel if this be subscribed, e. g. עֵשֶׂב Gen. 1 : 11, כִּי Gen. 31 : 6, Deut. 10 : 17; Mahpakh belongs under the consonant which precedes the tone-vowel, and after its vowel-sign if this be subscribed, e. g. הַנָּהָר Gen. 2 : 14, כִּי Gen. 32 : 33, Deut. 4 : 7. When the initial syllable bears the tone and there is no subscribed vowel, the laws of consecution must decide; thus, in הִיא the accent is Y'thibh in Gen.

3:15, 44:17; Deut. 10:17; but Mahpakh in Josh. 17:1.

§ 31. The accents already explained are called the prosaic accents, and are found in all the books of the Old Testament with the exception of the Psalms (תְּהִלִּים), Proverbs (מִשְׁלֵי), and the poetic portion of Job (אִיּוֹב), whose initials form the technical word אֱמֶת. Here a different system of accentuation prevails. Thirteen of the prosaic accents, one-half of the whole number, nowhere occur in the books just named, viz.: S'gholta, Zakeph-Katon, and Zakeph-Gadhol of the Kings, Pashta, Y'thibh, and T'bhir of the Dukes, Karne Phara, T'lisha Gh'dhola, Geresh, and G'rashayim, of the Counts, Merka Kh'phula, Darga, and T'lisha K'tanna of the Conjunctives. Such as are common to both systems are in the previous table distinguished by an asterisk. The powers of some of these, however, are altered, so that a new arrangement of them is necessary; and they are supplemented by additional signs formed by combining the prosaic accents or assigning them unusual positions. The scale of the poetical or metrical accents thus constituted is as follows, viz.:

DISJUNCTIVE ACCENTS.

Class I.

1.	Silluk	(֑)	הַכָּבוֹד׃	
2.	Athnahh	(֑)	הַכָּבֹוד	
3.	Merka-Mahpakh	(֦)	הַכָּבֹוד	

Class II.

4.	R'bhiᵃ	(֗)	הַכָּבֹוד	
5.	Pazer	(֡)	הַ כָּבֹוד	
6.	R'bhiᵃ Geresh	(֜)	הַכָּבֹוד	
7.	Tiphhha initial	(֖)	הַ֖כָּבֹוד	*prep.*
8.	Zarka	(֮)	הַכָּבֹוד	*postp.*
9.	P'sik	(׀)	הַכָּבֹוד ׀	*postp.*

CONJUNCTIVE ACCENTS.

10.	Merka	(ֽ)	הַכָּבוֹד
11.	Merka-Zarka	(ֽ֮)	הַכָּבוֹד
12.	Mahpakh	(֤)	הַכָּבוֹד
13.	Mahpakh-Zarka	(֤)	הַכָּבוֹד
14.	Munahh	(֣)	הַכָּבוֹד
15.	Munahh superior	(֬)	הַכָּבוֹד
16.	Yerahh ben Yomo	(֪)	הַכָּבוֹד
17.	Kadhma	(֨)	הַכָּבוֹד
18.	Tiphhha	(֖)	הַכָּבוֹד
19.	Shalsheleth	(֓)	הַכָּבוֹד

a. It will be perceived that there are fewer Disjunctives but more Conjunctives than are exhibited by the prosaic accents. Merka-Mahpakh answers substantially to S'gholta; R'hbi^a-Geresh to Tiphhha before Silluk, and Tiphhha initial to Tiphhha before Athnahh. Tiphhha and Shalsheleth are transferred from the list of Disjunctives to that of the Conjunctives, whence it comes to pass that if a word bearing either of these accents terminates in a vowel, Daghesh-lene will not be inserted in a following initial aspirate, e. g. עָשִׂיתָ בְּבַעַס Ps. 31:10, מְבוֹא פְתָחִים Prov. 8:3, יִתְפִּלְשׂוּ בְמִזְמוֹת Ps. 10:2.

b. P'sik, in the poetic as in the prosaic accents, is never used alone but always in conjunction with another accent. It serves to strengthen Disjunctives and to reduce the power of Conjunctives without disturbing the order of their consecution. It is thus used with Merka-Mahpakh Ps. 5:13, Pazer Ps. 10:14, Tiphhha initial Ps. 31:4, Mahpakh Ps. 5:9, Munahh Prov. 1:22, Merka Ps. 10:13, Kadhma Ps 10:5, Shalsheleth Ps. 7:6.

POSITION OF THE ACCENT

§ 32. The accent in Hebrew may fall either upon the ultimate or the penultimate syllable, but never at a greater remove from the end of the word. In the former case words are technically termed Milra (מִלְרַע *from below*), and in the latter Milēl (מִלְעֵיל *from above*).

1. The position of the accent may be considered in relation either to the syllabic or to the etymological structure of a word, that is to say, as affected by the nature of its syllables on the one hand or of the elements of which it is composed as a significant part of speech on the other. It is so far determined by the syllabic structure of words, that a long mixed syllable or a short simple syllable, whether in the ultimate or the penultimate, must receive the accent, § 18. 2. thus : לְרֹב , שָׂדֶה , וַתִּצְמֹדְנָה , יִצְחָק .

2. Considered in reference to their etymological structure, words exist in two conditions, (1.) their primary uninflected state, by which their essential and proper meaning is conveyed; (2.) with added affixes and prefixes, by which that meaning is variously modified. In their nude or primary state all words, whether primitives or derivatives, are accented upon the ultimate, and so continue to whatever flexion, involving no terminational appendages, they may be subjected. Thus, זִכָּרוֹן ; הִתְפַּקֵּד , יִפְקֹד , פָּקַד , פָּקֵד , פֹּקֵד , פָּקֹד , פָּקַד ; כְּנַעֲנִי ; יוֹמָם ; אַרְגְּמָן ; מְדַבֵּר , מְדַבָּר ; זִכָּרוֹן .

3. The only exception is a class of words called Segholates, in which the last vowel does not belong originally or essentially to the form, but is introduced for the sake of softening the pronunciation, § 61. 2 ; these are accented on the penultimate, as רֶגֶל , רָגֶל , כְּתֹנֶת , תֹּהוּ , בַּיִת , לֶצַח , סֵפֶר , מֶלֶךְ , יִשְׁתַּחוּ .

a. נֶעֱמָדָה Is. 50 : 8 is said to be the only instance of a word accented on the antepenult. The proper tone-syllable of this word is the ultimate, but upon the recession of the accent by § 35, the vowel next preceding, which has arisen from Sh'va and is unessential to the form, cannot receive it, so that it necessarily falls upon the one still further back.

§ 33. The additions which words may receive at the beginning or end affect the accent in proportion to the respective weight accorded to them. Additions to the end of words are of two sorts, which may be distinguished as affixes and suffixes. Affixes are so welded to the word or merged in it

that in the popular consciousness they have become an integral part of it, and their independent existence or separate origin is no longer thought of; such are the personal inflections of verbs and the terminations indicating gender and number in nouns and adjectives. Suffixes are not so intimately blended with the word to which they are attached as to have lost their individual identity and independent character, and consequently are of greater weight as respects the accent; such are the fragmentary pronouns appended to verbs, nouns, and prepositions.

1. If the appendage consists of a vowel (as וּ, ה, ָה, , יִ, ִי.), or begins with one (as ָם, ֵֶ, ָ, וֹת, ָ, ִֶ, יֶם, ָיו, ְ, ֶה, ִים, יָד,), and can consequently only be pronounced by the aid of the final consonant of the word to which it is attached, it will attract the accent to itself or to its initial vowel from a noun, adjective, participle, or preposition, as דְּבָרַי, קֳדָשַׁי, קֳדָשִׁים, דְּבָרִים, דְּבָרַי, דְּבָרֶיךָ, דְּבָרָיו from דָּבָר; דְּבָרוֹ from קֹדֶשׁ. Such an appendage to a verb, if a suffix, will so far accord with the rule just given as to carry the accent forward one syllable; but the accent will remain in its original position if it be an affix, unless it is either dissyllabic or causes the rejection of the vowel previously accented; הֶחֱרִים with a suffix הֶחֱרִימָם, but with an affix הֶחֱרִימוּ; עָבַד with a suffix עֲבָדוֹ, but with an affix עָבְדוּ, עֲבָדוּ; קָם, קָמָה, קָמוּ; קַל, קַלּוֹ, קַלָּה; אֲהַבְתָּהּ, אֲהֵבָה, אֲהַבְתָּךְ; אָהֵב, אָהַבְתִּי. It is to be observed, however, that a paragogic ָה or ֶה, § 61. 6, attached to nouns, pronouns, and adverbs, and occasionally a paragogic ִי. does not disturb the position of the accent, e. g. אֶרֶץ, רַבָּתִי, שָׂרָתִי, אֵלֶּה, הֵמָּה Lam. 1 : 1, but אַרְצָה; נָב, נֹבֶה; so הֵמָּה, אֵלֶּה, שָׂמָּה, רַבָּתִי Lam. 1 : 1, but מָלֵאֲתִי Isa. 1 : 21; neither does the feminine ending ֶת, which is a Segholate formation, e. g. מְדַבֵּר, מְדַבֶּרֶת.

a. Paragogic ָה receives the secondary accent Methegh in פַּדֶּנָה אֲרָם Gen. 28 : 2, 5, 6, 7.

2. The appending of a simple syllable, such as the

suffixes נָה , נוּ , תִּי , תָּ , or the verbal affixes תָ , תִּי , נוּ , נָה , מוֹ , הָ , הוּ , נוּ , נִי , will not alter the position of the accent provided it originally stood upon the ultimate; if, however, its original place was the penult, or if the syllable in question be attached to the word by a union vowel, the accent must be carried forward one syllable to prevent its standing on the antepenult, which is never admissible : מְאַסְתָּ , מָאַס , כְּסָתְנִי ; כְּסָמוֹ , כְּסָמוֹ , כְּסָהוּ , כְּסָה , קַלֹּתִי , קַלֹּות , קַל ; מְאַסְתָּנוּ . Suffixes appended to a word ending with a consonant mostly require a connecting vowel, and consequently shift the position of the accent. Affixes, by reason of the less weight accorded to them, commonly do not. The suffix הָ follows the general rule when preceded by a union vowel, but draws the accent upon itself when it is not, e. g. אָבִיהָ , יֶהְדָּהּ , יֶהְדָהּ , לָךְ . A consonantal appendage to a long unaccented vowel, inasmuch as it converts the ultimate into a mixed syllable, necessarily draws the accent upon it from the penult, § 32. 1, e. g. יְמוּתוּן , יָמוּתוּ ; מְאַסְתִּים , מְאַסְתִּיר , מְאַסְתִּי .

3. A mixed syllable, whether an affix as תֶּם , תֶּן , or suffix as הֶן , הֶם , כֶּן , כֶּם , will attract the accent to itself, הֲלַכְתֶּם from הָלַךְ ; מַלְכֵיכֶם , מַלְכְּכֶם , from מֶלֶךְ ; הֲרֵמֹתֶם from הֵרִים . In the unusual form כֻּלָּהֶם 2 Sam. 23 : 6, the accent stands upon the union vowel.

4. The only prefixes which exercise any influence upon the position of the accent, are the Vav conversive of the future, which draws back the accent from a mixed ultimate to a simple penult, וַיֵּשֶׁב , וַיֵּשֶׁב , וַיֹּאמֶר , יֹאמַר ; and the Vav conversive of the preterite, which throws it forward from the penult to a simple ultimate, וְיָשַׁבְתָּ , יָשַׁבְתָּ , וְאָמַרְתָּ , אָמַרְתָּ , וַהֲשִׁיבוֹתִי .

a. Some languages invariably accent the same part of the word ; thus, Bohemian and Lettish the initial syllable, Polish and Lazian, one of the Caucasian tongues, the penult of all polysyllables. Others, in which more freedom is allowed, have no respect to the etymological structure of words, but are guided entirely by the character of their syllables. Thus, in Arabic and Latin words are accented according to the quantity of the penult ; the accent is given to the penult if it is long, to the antepenult

ıf the penult is short. In others still the etymological principle is the prevailing one, and this often has a wider scope than in Hebrew. Thus, in Greek the accent has the range of the last three syllables. In Sanscrit it may stand upon any syllable whatever even of the longest words. In English it is almost equally free, e. g. *péremptorily, inconsiderátion,* its removal from its primary position upon the radical portion of the word being conditioned by the respective weight of the formative syllables appended, e. g. *pérson, pérsonate, pérsonally, persónify, personálity, personificátion.*

§ 34. The location of the accent being thus influenced by the etymological structure of words, it may serve to distinguish words of like appearance but different formation. Thus, מֵתָה Gen. 30 : 1, בָּאָה Gen. 29 : 6, are participles, but מֵּתָה Gen. 35 : 18, בָּאָה Gen. 29 : 9, are preterites, the feminine affix receiving the accent in one case but not in the other, § 33. 1. So בָּנוּ *they built* from בָּנָה, but בָּנוּ *in us;* שָׁבוּ *they carried captive* from שָׁבָה, but שָׁבוּ *they returned* from שׁוּב; אָחַז *he has seized,* but אֶחֱז Job 23 : 9 *I shall see* from חָזָה; יֵרַע *it shall be evil* from רָעַע, רָעָה *he shall feed* from רָעָה; מָרָה *he was rebellious,* מָרָה *it was bitter* from מַר; קוּמִי *arise thou* (fem.), קוּמִי *my rising up.*

§ 35. The position of the accent may be shifted from the following causes, viz.:

1. A Conjunctive is frequently removed from the ultimate to the penult if a Disjunctive immediately follows, whether upon a monosyllable or a dissyllable accented on the penult, in order to prevent the unpleasant concurrence of two accented syllables in closely connected words, e. g. קָרָא לַיְלָה Gen. 1 : 5, בָּנֶה עִיר Gen. 4 : 17, אָזְלַת לָךְ Deut. 32 : 36, וְתֹאבְדוּ דֶרֶךְ Ps. 2 : 12, לֶכֶת לְךָ Isa. 36 : 8. In a few exceptional cases the secondary accent Methegh remains to mark the original tone-syllable, after the principal accent has been thrown back, לִבְעֵר קָיִן Num. 24 : 22, נָבֵל צִיץ Isa. 40 : 7, הֲשָׁמַע עָם Deut. 4 : 33.

2. The special emphasis given to the last word of a clause or section, and represented by what are called the

pause accents, § 36, 2, *a*, is sometimes rendered more distinct by a change of the accented syllable from the ultimate to the penult, e. g. כָּלוּ , כָּלוּ ; עֵתָה , עַתָּה ; אֲתָה , אַתָּה ; אָנְכִי , אָנֹכִי ; or from the penult to the ultimate, particularly in the case of forms with Vav conversive of the future וַיֵּלֶךְ , וַיֵּלֶךְ ; so וַיֹּאמֶר , וַיָּקָם , וַיִּגְמֹל . The accent is in a few instances attracted to a short final syllable ending in a weak letter, which either loses its sound entirely, converting the syllable into a simple one, or requires considerable effort and energy of voice to make it distinctly heard, e. g. יֵרֶא Gen. 41 : 33 for יֵרָא ; so תֵּרֶא Zech. 9 : 5, Mic. 7 : 10, הֶחְשֵׁע Ps. 39 : 14 for הֶחְשֵׁע .

CONSECUTION OF ACCENTS IN PROSE.

§ 36. 1. The second use of the accents is to point out the relation of words to one another. The Disjunctives indicate a greater or less separation between the word on which they stand and the following one ; the Conjunctives indicate a connection. The greatest separation of all is effected by Silluk, which is written under the last word of every verse, and is followed invariably by two dots vertically placed (:), called Sōph Pāsūk (סוֹף פָּסוּק *end of the verse*). The next in power are Athnahh and S'gholta. When a verse was to be divided into two clauses, Athnahh was placed under the last word of the first clause, Silluk maintaining its position at the end of the verse. If it was to be divided into three clauses, which is the greatest number that any verse can have, the last word of the first clause receives S'gholta, the last word of the second Athnahh, and the last of all Silluk. Verses of one clause range from Gen. 26 : 6, containing three words, to such as Jer. 13 : 13 and 1 Chron. 28 : 1, containing more than twenty: the most common division is into two clauses, e. g. Gen. 1 : 1 הָאָרֶץ ... אֱלֹהִים ; three clauses

are much less frequent, Gen. 1 : 7 הָרָקִיעַֽ . . . לָרָקִיעַ . כֵּ֑ן׃
23 : 16, 24 : 30, 26 : 28.

a. In Job 1 : 8 S'gholta occurs in a verse of two clauses without Ath
nahh, probably because the accentuation is conformed to that of Job 2 : 3.

2. Each of these clauses is capable of subdivision to
whatever extent its length or character may seem to demand
by the Disjunctives Zakeph Katon, Zakeph Gadhol, R'bhi^a,
Pazer, and T'lisha Gh'dhola, according to the number of sec-
tions to be made and the various degrees of their completeness.
Thus, in Josh. 1 : 8 the clause of Athnahh is divided into
five sections, בָּ֑י . לַעֲשֹׂות . . לַיְלָה . . מִפִּיךָ . . . יָמוּשׁ, in 2 Kin.
1 : 6 into six, עֶקְרוֹן . . . שָׁלַח לִדְרֹשׁ . בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל . . יְהוָֹה . . אֵלָיו .
The choice of the accent to govern a particular section de-
pends not only upon its power, but likewise upon its rank,
the more exalted officer standing in ordinary cases nearer
the sovereign.   Accordingly toward the beginning of a clause
an inferior Disjunctive will be used, even though the separa-
tion is such as would require an accent of much higher
power to indicate it in a more advanced portion of the same
clause.   These accents, moreover, have not a fixed value like
the stops in other languages; their power is not absolute but
relative, and varies endlessly with the circumstances of the
case. Athnahh in Gen. 1 : 1 marks the greatest division in the
verse, but that is not sufficient to require a comma.   In the
next verse Zakeph Katon is equal to a semicolon in the first
clause and less than a comma in the second.   In Gen. 27 : 16
the separation indicated by R'bhi^a is wholly rhythmical.

a. Those accents which, as above described, mark the limits of clauses
and sections, are denominated pause accents.

§ 37. In the sections thus created the accents are dis-
posed relatively to the Disjunctive which marks its close.
Each ruler has his servant and subordinate officer, whose

function it is to wait upon him. In other words, each Disjunctive is regularly preceded by a particular Conjunctive and inferior Disjunctive; and the train of accents in each section is formed by arranging the Disjunctives in their fixed order of succession with or without their regular Conjunctives until all its words are supplied. The trains proper to the different sections are shown in the following table:

	Disjunctives. Class I.	Conjunctives.	Disjunctives. Class II.	Conjunctives.	Disjunctives. Class III.	Conjunctives.	Disjunctives. Class IV.	Conjunctives.
PRIMARY SECTIONS.								
SECONDARY SECTIONS.								
UNUSUAL SECTIONS.								

a. Accents of like forms are readily distinguishable in the table by the column in which they stand. Where perspicuity requires it the distinction will hereafter be made by appending their initial letters, thus: Kadhma ⁱᵏ Pashta ⁱᵖ, Mahpakh ᵐ, Y'thibh ᵛ.

§ 38. *Explanation of the Table.*—The trains preceding the three principal accents are exhibited in the horizontal lines of the uppermost division; those of the ordinary dependent sections in the middle division, and those of rare occurrence at the bottom.

1. *Train of Silluk.*—If Silluk be immediately preceded by a Conjunctive, it will be Merka; if a Disjunctive precede it in the same section, with or without an intervening Merka, it will be Tiphhha, Gen. 1 : 1. If there be a Conjunctive before Tiphhha, it will be Merka, Gen. 1 : 1; if two Conjunctives, which occurs but fourteen times, they will be Merka Kh'phula and Darga, Gen. 27 : 25, Lev. 10 : 1, 2 Chron. 20 : 30. The next Disjunctive before Tiphhha, in the same section, will be T'bhir, Gen. 1 : 4. If T'bhir be preceded by one Conjunctive, it will be Darga, Gen. 1 : 12, or Merka, Gen. 1 : 26; if by two, the second will be Kadhma, 1 Sam. 15 : 33, or Munahh, Gen. 2 : 4; and if by three, the third will be T'lisha K'tanna, Gen. 2 : 19. The next Disjunctive before T'bhir, in the same section, will be Geresh, Gen. 26 : 11, 27 : 4, or G'rashayim, Ex. 23 : 4. If Geresh be preceded by one Conjunctive, it will be Kadhma, Gen. 24 : 7, or Munahh, Isa. 60 : 17; if by a second, it will be T'lisha K'tanna, Gen. 2 : 5, or Munahh with P'sik, Gen. 28 : 9; if by a third, it will be Munahh, 1 Sam. 14 : 34; if by a fourth, it will also be Munahh, Deut. 1 : 19.

a. The parentheses of the table contain alternate accents. Thus, Merka is substituted for Darga and for Mahpakh (before Pashta in the clause of Zakeph Katon) if no more than one vowel intervenes between the Conjunctive and the king which it precedes, e. g. Gen. 1 : 22, Gen. 1 : 24, 26 ; Gen. 5 : 17, Deut. 1 : 2, 35. Munahh is also regularly substituted for Kadhma, whenever the accent stands on the initial letter of the word, Gen. 25 : 8, Gen. 19 : 35 ; 1 Kin. 19 : 7, Deut. 1 : 28 ; Gen. 19 : 12 ;

Eccl. 5 : 7. G'rashayim takes the place of Geresh provided the accent is on the ultimate and it is not preceded by Kadhma either on the same or the previous word, Ex. 16 : 23, 36 : 3. When two accents are included in a parenthesis the meaning is that if an additional accent is required, these two will take the place of the one before the parenthesis. P'sik has no separate place in the consecution, but is joined with the other accents to modify their power. It is constantly associated with the Disjunctive Shalsheleth to add to its strength, and occasionally with the different Conjunctives to reduce their strength, but without disturbing the order of their consecution, e. g. with Merka Ex. 16 : 5, Munahh Gen. 46 : 2, Mahpakh Ex. 30 : 34, Kadhma Lev. 11 : 32, Darga Gen. 42 : 13, T'lisha K'tanna 1 Sam. 12 : 3.

2. *Train of Athnahh.*—If Athnahh be preceded by a Conjunctive, it will be Munahh, Gen. 1 : 1; if by a Disjunctive in its own section, it will be Tiphhha, Gen. 1 : 1. The accents which precede Tiphhha have already been mentioned in explaining the train of Silluk.

3. *Train of S'gholta.*—The first Conjunctive before S'gholta will be Munahh, Gen. 3 : 3; if there be two, the second will be Munahh, Lev. 8 : 31, or Merka, Gen. 3 : 14. The first Disjunctive in its section will be Zarka, Gen. 1 : 28; and if this be preceded by one Conjunctive, it will be Munahh, Gen. 1 : 7, or Merka, 1 Chron. 5 : 18; if by two, the second will be Kadhma, Gen. 30 : 16, 31 : 32; if by three, the second will be Munahh and the third Kadhma, Lev. 4 : 35. The next Disjunctive before Zarka will be Geresh, Gen. 24 : 7, or G'rashayim, Ex. 39 : 3. The accents preceding these have been explained in 1.

4. *Train of Zakeph Katon.*—The first Conjunctive before Zakeph Katon will be Munahh, Gen. 1 : 2, the second likewise Munahh, Gen. 27 : 45. The first Disjunctive will be Pashta, Gen. 1 : 2; or, if the proper place of the accent be the first letter of the word, Y'thibh, Gen. 1 : 11, 2 : 11. The first Conjunctive before Pashta will be Mahpakh, Gen. 1 : 9, or Merka, Gen. 1 : 2; the second, Kadhma, Gen. 39 : 19, or Munahh, Gen. 1 : 12; the third will be T'lisha K'tanna, Ezr. 3 : 11. The Disjunctive before Pashta will be

Geresh, Gen. 1 : 24, or G'rashayim, Gen. 1 : 11 ; the further consecution is explained in 1.

a. In some instances Pashta is found not in the train of Zakeph Katon, but seeming to govern an independent section, e. g. Ex. 29 : 20, Deut. 9 : 6, Josh. 10 : 11, 2 Sam. 14 : 7, 2 Chron. 18 : 23.

5. Zakeph Gadhol is mostly used instead of Zakeph Katon when no other accent precedes it in its own section, whether upon the same word or one before it : אַךְ בָּשָׂר Gen. 9 : 4 (in some editions), in which it is preceded by Munahh, is exceptional.

6. *Train of R'bhi*ᵃ.—The first Conjunctive before R'bhiᵃ will be Munahh, Gen. 1 : 9 ; the second, Munahh commonly with P'sik, Gen. 2 : 5, or Darga, Gen. 6 : 15 ; the third, Munahh with P'sik, Gen. 7 : 23, 31 : 29, or Merka, Ex. 14 : 10. The Disjunctive before R'bhiᵃ will be Geresh, Ex. 16 : 3, or G'rashayim, Deut. 1 : 11, which are preceded as in 1.

7. *Train of Pazer.*—Pazer may be preceded by one Munahh, 1 Sam. 14 : 34, by two, Ezek. 9 : 2, by three, 1 Sam. 14 : 34, or by four, Isa. 66 : 20.

8. *Train of T'lisha Gh'dhola.*—T'lisha Gh'dhola is the weakest of the Disjunctives which are ever set to rule independent sections. Its weakness is in fact such, that it is sometimes drawn into the section of a stronger Disjunctive ; thus, in Gen. 1 : 12, Lev. 4 : 7, 1 Sam. 17 : 51, Isa. 9 : 5, Neh. 5 : 18, it takes the place of T'lisha K'tanna among the antecedents of Pashta, standing between it and Geresh or G'rashayim ; in Gen. 13 : 1, 21 : 14, Deut. 26 : 12, it stands similarly between T'bhir and Geresh or G'rashayim. And in many cases, perhaps in most, when it rules a section of its own, this is a mere subsection, not so much a division of one of the principal clauses as a fragment broken off from one of the larger sections at a point where T'lisha K'tanna would have stood had the connection been sufficiently close

to require a Conjunctive, e. g. Gen. 19 : 2, 1 Kin. 20 : 28. That this is not always so appears, however, from examples like 2 Sam. 14 : 32, Gen. 7 : 7, Isa. 66 : 19, Jer. 39 : 5, and particularly Gen. 31 : 52, where וְאִם־אַתָּה corresponds to the preceding אִם־אָנִי. T'lisha Gh'dhola may be preceded by one Munahh, Gen. 27 : 46, by two, Josh. 2 : 1, by three, or by four, 1 Kin. 2 : 5.

9. Shalsheleth occurs but seven times, viz., Gen. 19 : 16, 24 : 12, 39 : 8, Lev. 8 : 23, Isa. 13 : 8, Am. 1 : 2, Ezr. 5 : 12, and in every instance stands upon the initial word of the verse, and is accompanied by P'sik. It has consequently no antecedents.

10. Karne Phara is only used sixteen times. Its section never contains less than three words : its immediate predecessor is always Yerahh ben Yomo, to which may be added one Munahh, Num. 35 : 5, Neh. 5 : 13, 13 : 5, 2 Chron. 24 : 5 ; two, 2 Kin. 10 : 5, Jer. 38 : 25, Est. 7 : 9, Neh. 1 : 6, 2 Chron. 35 : 7 ; three, Josh. 19 : 51, 2 Sam. 4 : 2, Jer. 13 : 13 ; four, 1 Chron. 28 : 1 ; or five, Ezek. 48 : 21.

§ 39. 1. The complete trains of the several accents contain one Disjunctive from each of the inferior orders, disposed in due succession of rank, with one Conjunctive immediately preceding the first class of Disjunctives, two Conjunctives preceding the second class, three the third class, four or more the fourth class. These trains are adapted to sections of different length and character by omitting such of the Conjunctives, and more rarely by repeating such of the Disjunctives, as the mutual relations of the words may seem to require, and breaking off the series as soon as every word in the section is supplied. Thus, while the general order of consecution is fixed and invariable, there is the utmost liberty and variety in particular cases.

a. In a very few instances the Conjunctives go beyond the number here assigned. Thus, Athnahh is preceded by two Munahhs in Ex. 3 : 4,

and, according to some editions, in Isa. 48:11. T'bhir is preceded by four Conjunctives, Josh. 10:11, 2 Chron. 22:11, Isa. 66:20; Pashta by four, Ex. 5:8, 2 Kin. 5:1, and even by five, Josh. 19:51.

2. If a section consists of but a single word, this will receive the appropriate Disjunctive, the entire antecedent series of the table being then omitted as unnecessary; thus, Silluk וַיָּמֹת׃ Gen. 5:5; Athnahh וַיֹּאמֶר Gen. 24:34; Zakeph Katon וּכְנָבֵּהּ Isa. 1:30; R'bhi[a] וְהַמַּיִם Gen. 7:19; Pazer וַיֹּאמֶר Gen. 22:2; T'lisha Gh'dhola לָךְ Gen. 19:8. This, as has been already said, is the regular length of the sections of Zakeph Gadhol and Shalsheleth; but those of S'gholta are never composed of less than two words, and those of Karne Phara never of less than three.

3. In sections of greater length there is a disposition towards a regular alternation of Disjunctives and Conjunctives upon successive words, e. g. Gen. 23:11 : , , ، , ، , ، Gen. 24:7 ˚ ، ˝ ، ˊ ˈ[k], and consequently though two or more Conjunctives may be allowed before a particular Disjunctive, only the first of these is in the majority of cases employed. The actual relations of words may, however, so interfere with this regularity as on the one hand to cause the intervening Conjunctives to be dropped entirely, e. g. Gen. 1:22 ، ، ، ، , 1 Chron. 15:18 ˝ ˊ ˝ ˊ ، ˊ ˊ , or, on the other, to introduce as many Conjunctives as the table will admit, e. g. Gen. 3:14 ˚ ، , ˝ ، ˈ[k]. But if either of the three primary sections consist of but two words, the first must have a Disjunctive accent, however close its relation may be to the second, e. g. : וַיִּטַּע כָּרֶם׃ Gen. 9:20, וְנִפְקְחוּ עֵינֵיכֶם Gen. 3:5, טֶרֶם יִשְׁכָּבוּ Gen. 19:4.

---

a. In Gen. 24:15, where, however, editions differ, Silluk is in a section of two words immediately preceded by Merka.

b. Sometimes an excluded term of the series will take the place of the secondary accent Methegh, § 44. Tiphhha is thus five times written upon the same word with Silluk, e. g. Num. 15:21, and eleven times with

Athnahh, e. g. Num. 28 : 26. Munahh, Gen. 21 : 17, for which Kadhma is sometimes substituted, Gen. 18 : 21, often stands upon the same word with Zakeph Katon. Kadhma is also joined in this manner with Munahh, Lev. 10 : 12, Merka, Judg. 21 : 21, Neh. 12 : 44, Mahpakh, Lev. 25 : 46, and Geresh, Ex. 16 : 15, 21 : 22, 35. Mahpakh with Munahh, Lam. 4 : 9.

4. Occasionally a subordinate Disjunctive or its alternate is repeated in the same section with or without its antecedents. Thus, T'bhir, Deut. 26 : 2 $\,\,\,\,\,\,\,\,\,^{'k}\,\,\,^{'k}$, so Deut. 30 : 20, 1 Sam. 20 : 21, 2 Kin. 17 : 36. Zarka, 2 Kin. 1 : 16 $\,\,\,\,\,\,\,\,\,'$, so ver. 6, Gen. 42 : 21, Jer. 21 : 4, Neh. 2 : 12. Pashta, Gen. 24 : 14, 42, 48, 65; 1 Kin. 20 : 9. Pashta, Pashta and Y'thibh, 2 Kin. 10 : 30, Ezr. 7 : 25. Geresh and G'rashayim, Gen. 28 : 9.

a. There is a double accentuation of part of Gen. 35 : 22, and of the entire decalogue, both in Ex. 20 : 2-17, and Deut. 5 : 6-21, which involves a double vocalization in certain words, e. g. : פָּנַי Ex. 20 : 3, i. e. either פָּנַי: or פָּנָי. Single words also occur with alternative accents, e. g. with G'rashayim or Geresh and T'lisha Gh'dhola זֶ֞ה Gen. 5 : 29, קֹרְבֹּ֞ו Lev. 10 : 4, שָׁבוּ֒ 2 Kin. 17 : 13, וּלְאֵלֶּה֒ Ezek. 48 : 10, זֹ֞את Zeph. 2 : 15.

POETIC CONSECUTION.

§ 40. 1. The principle of the consecution is the same in the poetic as in the prosaic accents, although there is considerable diversity in the details. There is a like division of verses into clauses and sections ruled by a Disjunctive at the end, which imposes upon them its own special train of accents. The sections are fewer, however, and the trains shorter than in prose, on account of the greater brevity of the sentences in poetry for the most part. But this reduction is more than compensated by the new complexity arising from the latitude allowed in the choice of Conjunctives, which it seems impossible to reduce to fixed rules, and is probably to be referred to their use as musical notes for the

cantillation of the synagogue. It should be added, that the embarrassment arising from this inherent complexity of the subject is seriously aggravated by the numerous discrepancies in the different editions of the Bible, by which the true accentuation in the three poetical books is often involved in doubt and uncertainty.

a. In addition to availing himself of the researches of others, particularly of Nordheimer and Ewald in their discussions of this subject, the author has examined verse by verse the entire book of Proverbs and the first division of the Psalms (Ps. 1–41), as well as other selected Psalms and portions of Job. As the result, he confesses himself quite unable to disentangle the mystery; and as the only contribution he can make towards its solution he has concluded to present in detail, and in as convenient a form as possible, the facts observed, hoping that some future exploration may discover the principle of order, if any such principle there be, in this apparently inextricable confusion.

2. Verses may consist of one, two, or three clauses, distinguished by the three Disjunctives of the first class. If the verse contain but one clause, Silluk will be written upon the last word, Ps. 4 : 1 ; if it contain two clauses, the division will be made by Athnahh, Ps. 1 : 4, or by Merka-Mahpakh, Ps. 1 : 2. 3 : 3, upon the last word of the first clause ; if it contain three, the last word of the first will have Merka-Mahpakh, the last word of the second Athnahh, and the last word of the third Silluk, Ps. 1 : 1. Clauses may consist of a single section when no subdivision of them is necessary ; or they may consist of two or more sections, when the subdivision is effected by R'bhiᵃ or Pazer, e. g. ⋮ ___˙ Ps. 18 : 51, ⋮ _____ ˇPs. 7 : 6, ₐ ____ˊ __ ˇ Prov. 1 : 10, ₐ ___˙_˙ Ps. 41 : 7, ₐ ___˙_ˇ Ps. 7 : 6, ₚ ____ˊ__ˇPs. 17 : 14.

§ 41. The order of the accents in the various sections is exhibited in the following table :

	DISJUNCTIVES. CLASS I.	CONJUNCTIVES.	DISJUNCTIVES. CLASS II.	CONJUNCTIVES.
PRINCIPAL SECTIONS.				
SUBORDINATE SECTIONS.				

Explanation of the Table.

a. Train of Silluk.—If Silluk is preceded by a single Conjunctive, it will be Munahh, Prov. 1:4, or Merka either alone as Prov. 1:2, or compounded with Zarka, Ps. 10:5, and P'sik, Ps. 10:3. If it be preceded by two Conjunctives, they will be Ps. 5:5, Ps. 10:6, Prov. 12:1 (in some editions), Prov. 25:26, Ps. 18:7, Ps. 36:1, or Prov.

8:13. If it be preceded by three Conjunctives, they will be ⌐⌐, Ps. 24:6 ⌐ Ps. 10:2 (or ⌐ Ps. 7:6), ⌐⌐ Prov. 26:25 (or ⌐⌐ Ps. 28:8 or ⌐⌐ Prov. 29:13), ⌐⌐ Ps. 4:8, ⌐⌐ Prov. 3:27, ⌐⌐. If it be preceded by four Conjunctives, they will be ⌐⌐, Ps. 89:2, ⌐⌐ Ps. 32:5, or ⌐⌐ Ps. 3:3 (in some editions ⌐⌐). If it be preceded by five Conjunctives, they will be ⌐⌐, Job 32:6, 37:12 (in this latter example some editions substitute a Makkeph for Merka).

If Silluk be preceded by a Disjunctive in its own section, it will be R'bhiᵃ-Geresh, Ps. 1:1, 5:3, 10. R'bhiᵃ-Geresh may be preceded by one Conjunctive, , Ps. 5:4; by two, , , Ps. 8:2, or , ͨ Ps. 31:10, 19; by three, , , ͨ or , ͨ ͨ Ps. 73:4.

There are occasional deviations from the Conjunctives of the table; thus, R'bhiᵃ-Geresh is in Ps. 34:8 preceded by ⌐⌐. In some of these cases, however, editions differ in their notation of the accents. Thus, in Ps. 5:7 some editions have ⌐⌐ before Silluk, others ⌐⌐; in Ps. 18:36, Prov. 30:17, some have ⌐⌐, others ⌐⌐; in Ps. 20:2 some have ⌐⌐, others ⌐⌐; in Prov. 24:8 some have ⌐⌐, others ⌐⌐, the two words being joined by Makkeph. So, again, some editions have in Ps. 9:11 ⌐ before R'bhiᵃ-Geresh, in Ps. 18:44 ⌐, in Prov. 27:19 ⌐⌐, in Prov. 21:17 ⌐⌐; while other editions do not depart in these passages from the order given in the table. Similar discrepancies exist in the other sections likewise.

b. Train of Athnahh.—Athnahh may be preceded by one Conjunctive, ⌐ Ps. 5:8 (or ⌐⌐ Prov. 8:30, 34), ⌐ Ps. 5:3 (or ⌐⌐ Ps. 35:21, ⌐⌐ Ps. 69:2), ⌐ Prov. 23:3, ⌐ Ps. 14:3, Prov. 6:3 (or ⌐⌐ Prov. 16:10); by two, ⌐⌐ Ps. 6:8 (or ⌐⌐ Ps. 7:17), ⌐⌐ Prov. 28:25, Ps. 5:2 (in some editions the latter example has ⌐⌐), ⌐⌐ Ps. 14:5, ⌐⌐ Prov. 11:12, 14:21, ⌐⌐ Ps. 37:1, ⌐⌐ Prov. 8:21, ⌐⌐ Ps. 25:16; by three, ⌐⌐ Prov. 24:21, ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 6:6 (or ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 9:10, or ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 16:10), ⌐⌐ Ps. 10:17, ⌐⌐⌐ Prov. 8:13, ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 18:50, ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 10:13, ⌐⌐ Prov. 6:27, ⌐⌐ Ps. 72:3; by four, ⌐⌐⌐ Prov. 3:12, ⌐⌐⌐⌐ Prov. 24:16, ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 34:7, ⌐⌐⌐ Ps 32:2 (in some editions), ⌐⌐⌐ Prov. 1:19, ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 65:2.

If Athnahh be preceded by a Disjunctive in its own section, it will be Tiphhha initial, Ps. 1:6, 26:4. Tiphhha initial may be preceded by one Conjunctive, ⌐ Ps. 5:6; by two, ⌐⌐ Ps. 9:19 (or ⌐⌐ Ps. 14:1, or ⌐⌐ Ps. 16:9), ⌐⌐ Ps. 32:11, ⌐⌐ Ps. 35:14, 15, ⌐⌐ Prov. 25:20; by three, ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 23:6, ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 27:1, ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 12:5 (or ⌐⌐⌐ Prov. 27:14), ⌐⌐⌐ Ps. 9:14.

c. Train of Merka-Mahpakh.—Merka-Mahpakh may be preceded by one Conjunctive, which is almost always Yerahh ben Yomo, Ps. 1:1

though occasionally it is, in some editions at least, Merka, Ps. 15 : 5, 35 : 10, or Mahpakh, Ps. 24 : 8, 31 : 10. If it be preceded by a Disjunctive in its own section, Zarka will be employed, Ps. 1 : 1, Prov. 1 : 11.

Zarka may be preceded by one Conjunctive, Ps. 12 : 7 (or Prov. 1 : 22), Ps. 6 : 3, Ps. 12 : 3, Ps. 31 : 12; by two, Prov. 30 : 15 (in some editions), Ps. 24 : 10 (or Ps. 13 : 6), Ps. 21 : 10, Ps. 27 : 2 (or Ps. 35 : 26), Ps. 7 ; 10; by three, Ps. 29 : 9, Ps. 31 : 14, Ps. 10 : 14; or by four, Ps. 40 : 6.

*d. Train of R'bhi*ᵃ.—R'bhiᵃ may be preceded by one Conjunctive, Ps. 5 : 1, Ps. 8 : 2 (or Ps. 23 : 4, or Ps. 6 : 7), Prov. 28 : 22, Ps. 22 : 25, Ps. 11 : 2 (or Ps. 5 : 11); by two, Prov. 8 : 33, Ps. 28 : 7 (or Ps. 18 : 3), Ps. 9 : 7, Ps. 11 : 4, Ps. 26 : 1, Ps. 27 : 6 (or Ps. 5 : 9), Prov. 6 : 22, Ps. 18 : 1 (or Ps. 7 : 7, or Ps. 39 : 5), Job 16 : 10; or by three, Ps. 40 : 7, Ps. 41 : 7 (or Ps. 39 : 6, or Ps. 3 : 8, or Ps. 41 : 14), Ps. 19 : 14 (or Ps. 39 : 12), Ps. 40 : 11, Prov. 24 : 31.

e. Train of Pazer.—Pazer may be preceded by one Conjunctive, Ps. 89 : 20 (or Prov. 30 : 8), Ps. 32 : 5 (or Ps. 17 : 14); by two, Ps. 5 : 10, Prov. 7 : 23 (or Ps. 28 : 5), Ps. 13 : 3 (or Prov. 27 : 10), Ps. 90 : 4, Ps. 7 : 6, Ps. 39 : 13, Ps. 11 : 2, Ps. 5 : 12; or by three, Ps. 22 : 35, 23 : 4, Prov. 23 : 29 (where some editions have).

§ 42. The trains of these several accents are adjusted to sections of varying length by expedients similar to those employed with the prose accents, viz. : 1. Omitting the Conjunctives in whole or in part. 2. Repeating the Disjunctives, e. g. Ps. 14 : 1, Ps. 17 : 14, or their equivalents, e. g. Tiphhha initial before Ps. 7 : 10, before Ps. 9 : 1; before Ps. 18 : 1, before Ps. 22 : 15 ; before Tiphhha initial Ps. 16 : 17. 3. Writing two accents upon the same word, מִמֹּעֲצוֹתֵיהֶם Ps. 5 : 11, הוֹרֵנִי Ps. 27 : 11, וַיֵּרָאוּ Ps. 18 : 16. 4. Uniting two or more words by Makkeph, so that they require but a single accent. 5. Writing the different parts of a compound accent upon separate words; thus, Merka-Mahpakh אֲמִלַּל אָנִי Ps. 6 : 3, Merka-Zarka כִּי חָפֵץ Ps. 22 : 9, Mahpakh-Zarka כִּי בָאתָ Prov. 6 : 3.

a. Sometimes when two accents are written upon the same word, one is the alternate of the other; thus, בֶּצַע Prov. 1:19, may be either בֶּצַע or בֶּצַע according as the accent remains in its proper position in the ultimate, or is thrown back upon the penult in consequence of the next word being accented upon its initial syllable.

MAKKEPH.

§43. Makkeph (מַקֵּף *joining*) is a horizontal stroke by which two, three, or even four words may be united. אִם־תַּעֲשֶׂה־לִּי , אֶתֶּן־לָךְ Gen. 30:31, יֶשׁ־לִי־כֹל Gen. 33:11, עַל־כָּל־דְּבַר־פֶּשַׁע Gen. 12:20, 25:5, Ex. 20:11, וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ Ex. 22:8, עַל־כָּל־בְּנֵי־שָׁחַץ Job 41:26. It belongs properly to the accentual system, words which are closely related being often connected in this manner in order to obviate the necessity of unduly multiplying Conjunctive accents. Thus, the first fifteen words of Ex. 22:8 are in this manner reduced to eight. Monosyllabic particles are frequently, and some almost constantly, linked with the succeeding or preceding word, of which they may be regarded as in a manner appendages; thus, נָא , גַּם , פֶּן , אַל , כֹּל , אֶת , עַל , אֶל , etc. Examples are not wanting, however, of longer words similarly united, e. g. שְׁלֹשָׁה־עָרִים Deut. 19:15, נֶפֶשׁ־הַיֶּלֶד 1 Kin. 17:21, אָמַר־יְהֹוָה Isa. 31:4. This use of Makkeph is not to be confounded with that of the hyphen in modern languages between the members of a compound, as *self-same*, *master-builder*. Words united by Makkeph are still as separate as ever in character and signification; but they are pronounced together and are accented as though they formed but one word. Hence, whatever number of words be thus joined, the last only will receive an accent. And, as a further consequence, if a word preceding Makkeph properly ends in a long mixed syllable, this will, by the loss of the accent, be shortened, אֶת־שְׁנֵי , כָּל־עוֹף , הִתְהַלֶּךְ־נָא , or failing this, will commonly receive the secondary accent Methegh, שֵׁם־יוֹסֵף , אִיד־יִרְאַת .

a. Tsere remains before Makkeph in עֵץ, צֵר, נֵר, כֵּן; it sometimes remains and is sometimes shortened in שֵׁם, שֵׁשׁ *six*, עֵת e. g. Gen. 16 : 13 שֵׁם־יְהֹוָה, but ver. 15 שֶׁם־בְּנוֹ. It once remains according to some editions in אֶת־ Job 41 : 26, a word which is three times written אֶת without Makkeph, Ps. 47 : 5, 60 : 2, Prov. 3 : 12. Comp. § 19. 2, *a.*

b. Makkeph is occasionally found in the middle of a long word, which has been erroneously divided into two, e. g. יִפֵּה־פִיָּה Jer. 46 : 20, and perhaps פְּקַח־קוֹחַ Isa. 61 : 1. Sometimes words are thus divided without a Makkeph to unite the sundered parts, e. g. בָּחֻר בְּתֵירָם Lam. 4 : 3, כְּיַ עֵלִים 2 Chron. 34 : 6, and probably לַחְפֹּר פֵּרוֹת Isa. 2 : 20, אָהֲבוּ הֵבוּ Hos. 4 : 18, (See Dr. Alexander's Commentary on this passage.) The last two examples are plainly intended by the punctuators to be read as separate words. This might likewise be done in the preceding examples if they were pointed כְּיַ עֵלִים and בָּחֹר בְּתֵירָם.

METHEGH.

§ 44. Methegh (מֶתֶג *bridle*), a small perpendicular stroke under the initial letter of the syllable to which it belongs, is a secondary accent denoting a stress of voice inferior to the main accent. As this latter always has its place in Hebrew either upon the ultimate or the penult, distinctness was promoted and monotony relieved, especially in long words, by giving prominence to one or more of the antecedent syllables. There is a natural tendency to heighten the force of the accent by passing lightly over the immediately preceding syllable, this diminished force creating in its turn a new stress upon that next beyond it, and so on in alternate elevations and depressions to the beginning of the word. Agreeably to the principle just stated, Methegh regularly stands in polysyllables upon the second syllable before the accent, and again upon the fourth if the word have so many, e. g. וּמֵהַתְּכֵלֹת, מִמִּסְגְּרוֹתֵיהֶם, בְּתֵיהֶם, וְהֹצִיאַנִי, יֵאָסֵף, הָאֵלֶם. And so upon two or more words connected by Makkeph, which are pronounced as one, e. g. יִרְאֶה־לּוֹ Gen. 22 : 8, כִּי־אִם־לֶחֶם 1 Sam. 21 : 7.

a. Sometimes, however, particularly when the nature of the syllables requires it, § 32. 1, Methegh takes the place of the principal accent before

Makkeph irrespective of the position of the accent upon the following word, הַשָּׁאִיר־לוֹ Num. 21: 35, מֶלֶךְ־הַבָּשָׁן Num. 21: 33, מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל Jer. 34: 1 וְכָל־שֶׁה־חוּם Gen. 30: 32, הֲלוֹא־זֶה 1 Sam. 21: 12, כִּי־לִי Ex. 19: 5.

b. It is to be observed that the position of Methegh is determined by that of the tone-syllable, not by that of the accentual sign when these are not coincident, as frequently happens with prepositives and postpositives, e. g. הַעִידֹתִי Deut. 4: 26, וְהוֹרֵתִנוּ Josh. 22: 27, where the tone falls on the penult, לְהוֹקִים Jer. 26: 21, where the tone is upon the ultimate.

§ 45. The secondary accent is liable to be shifted from its normal position for the following reasons, viz. :

1. If the syllable which should receive it is mixed, it may be given in preference to an antecedent simple syllable, e. g. מֵהִתְהַלֵּךְ Job 1: 7, וּמֵהִתְהַלֵּךְ 2 Sam. 22: 24, וָאֶשְׁתַּמְּרָה Ezek. 42: 5, שָׁאַל־הָאִישׁ Gen. 43: 7 ; or if none such precede, it may be omitted altogether, e. g. וַיִּמְאָסֵם Jer. 33: 24, אֶת־כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה Deut. 6: 25, הַיִּזְרְעֵאלִי 1 Kin. 21: 1.

2. It is always given to simple syllables when followed by a vocal Sh'va, whether simple or compound, or a vowel which has arisen from Sh'va, the slight pronunciation proper to the Sh'va or its derivative giving new prominence to the preceding vowel, בְּשִׁקֲתוֹת, כַּאֲשֶׁר, יִהְיֶה, וְאָמְרוּ Gen. 30: 38, יֶחֱרְדוּ ; sometimes to intermediate syllables, § 20. 2, e. g. סְבָכָי Isa. 9: 17, 10: 34, עֲמָדְךָ Obad. ver. 11, particularly after He interrogative or when Daghesh-forte has been omitted as after the article, Vav conversive, and the preposition מִן, e. g. לַמְנַצֵּחַ, הַצְפַרְדְּעִים, כִּנֹּרוֹת, הַלְלוּ, הִתְשַׁלַּח, הַמְשֹׁל, וַיְהִי ; rarely and only as an exception to a mixed syllable standing in the first place before the principal accent, e. g. תַּדְשֵׁא Gen. 1: 11, הַבָּתִּים Ex. 12: 7, Zech. 14: 2.

a. It hence appears how Methegh comes to be of use in distinguishing the doubtful vowels, § 19, and to what extent it can be relied upon for this end. As it invariably accompanies the vowel of a simple syllable when followed by vocal Sh'va, it must always be found with $\bar{a}$, $\bar{\imath}$, and $\bar{u}$ preceding Sh'va, inasmuch as this will necessarily be vocal. Initial וּ $\bar{u}$, the unemphatic conjunction, is an exception, with which it is commonly not written, e. g. וּנְקֵבָה Gen. 6: 19, וּלְלֵאָה Gen. 31: 4, though it is sometimes,

e. g. וּלְהַבְדִּיל Gen. 1:18, וּשְׁבֵה Judg. 5:12. The absence of Methegh, except in the case just mentioned, is consequently conclusive evidence of the shortness of the vowel. As, however, short vówels in intermediate syllables, and in a few rare instances even in mixed syllables, may receive Methegh, the presence of this sign does not of itself determine the vowe¹ to be long; the ultimate decision must in this case depend on other con- siderations.

3. When by the operation of the preceding rule Me- thegh comes to stand in the first place before the accent, another Methegh is nevertheless occasionally found in the second place, the two thus standing in immediate succession, e. g. בְּמַחֲלֶה Gen. 32:22, וַיַּעֲלוּ Gen. 45:25 ; and even three occur upon successive syllables, e. g. וּמִמַּעֲמָדְךָ Isa. 22:19. But commonly where there is more than one Methegh, their position relatively to each other is governed by the same rules as the position of Methegh generally with relation to the principal accent, e. g. וְאַחֲרִיתֹה , וַהֲשֵׁבֹתָ , לִישׁוּעָתֹה , מֵהַקְּהָלִים .

4. Methegh is sometimes written under a letter with Sh'va, e. g. שְׁלַח־נָא Job 1:11, 2:5, הֵעֲרוּ־אַפּוֹ Job 19:6, נֶנְתְּקָה Ps. 2:3, כְּמַהְפֵּכַת Jer. 49:18, בְּמֵעַי Ruth 1:11.

> *a.* A Methegh so situated is called Gayā (גַּעְיָא *bellowing*) by Jewish grammarians, and, according to Elias Levita, it occurs eighty-four times, the number yielded by its name arithmetically reckoned. Methegh upon a short vowel before a compound Sh'va was called Maʰrīkh (מַאֲרִיךְ *pro- longing*), with a short Hhirik it was called Hhīrūk (חִירוּק *gnashing*).

5. The place of Methegh is frequently supplied by an accent chosen agreeably to the laws of consecution, § 39. 3. *b.*, e. g. אֲנַחֲמְכֶם Isa. 66:13, לֵאלֹהֵיהֶם Deut. 12:31, וְאֶסָעֲרֵם Zech. 7:14, וְעַל־צְבָא Num. 10:23, וַיִּקְהֲלוּ Josh. 22:12.

> *a.* The want of consistency or of uniformity, which may be occasion ally observed, in regard to the insertion or omission of Methegh, e. g. שֶׁאָרְבָּה Cant. 1:7, שֶׁאָהֲבָה Cant. 3:1 ; שֶׁהֵם Cant. 6:5, שֶׁהֵם Lam. 4:9;

עַרְבֹת Num. 31:12, עַרְבֹות Josh. 4:13, and the discrepancies between different manuscripts and editions, e. g. אֶלְבָה or אֶלְכָּה Gen. 45:28, שְׁאוּ־זִמְרָה or שְׂאוּ־זִמְרָה Ps. 81:3, if not arising in the first instance from clerical errors, are probably to be attributed to the inferior importance of the sign itself, whose place might be presumed to be sufficiently determined even if not written.

K'RI AND K'THIBH.

§ 46. Various notes extracted from the Masora (מָסוֹרָה *tradition*), a collection of remarks upon the text, are found in the margin of the Hebrew Bible, which are explained in the glossary at the end of most editions. The most important of these are the various readings known as the K'rī (קְרִי *read*), and K'thībh (כְּתִיב *written*). If in any instance traditional usage sanctioned a reading different from that which was written in the text or the K'thibh, the punctuators did not venture to alter the text itself for the sake of making the correction; they went no further than to connect with the letters of the text the vowels of the word to be substituted for it in reading or the K'ri, with a reference to the margin where the letters of the substitute might be found. Thus, with the word וַיֹּאמְרוּ Josh. 6:7 is connected the marginal note ויאמר קרי. The vowels here attached to the K'thibh belong not to it but to the unpointed word in the margin, which is accordingly וַיֹּאמֶר. The proper vowels for the pronunciation of the K'thibh are not written, but must be supplied from a knowledge of the form indicated by the letters, which in this case is וַיֹּאמְרוּ. Again, in ver. 9, תִּקְעָר in the text refers to תקעי ק in the margin; the K'ri is here תִּקְעָר, and the K'thibh, whose vowels are left to be determined by the reader, תְּקְעֹי. Jer. 42:6 has אֲנַךְ where the marginal note is אנחנו קרי; the K'ri is accordingly אֲנַחְנוּ, and the K'thibh אֲנוּ. In order to indicate that a given word was to be omitted in reading, it was left unpointed, and the

note כְּתִיב וְלֹא קְרִי, *written but not read*, placed in the margin,
e. g. חֲמֵשׁ Ezek. 48 : 16, נָא 2 Kin. 5 : 18, יִדְרֹךְ Jer. 51 : 3.
If, on the other hand, a word was to be supplied, its vowels
were inserted in the text and its letters placed in the margin,
with the note קְרִי וְלֹא כְתִיב, *read but not written*, e. g. Judg.
20 : 13 in the text ‎ בְ , and in the margin בְּנִי, to be read
בְּנֵי; so Jer. 31 : 38 בָּאִים. In 1 Kin. 21 : 8 the first letter
of הַסְּפָרִים is left unpointed as superfluous, and in Job 2 : 7
עַד is explained by the margin to stand for וְעַד: so Jer. 18 : 23
וְיִהְיוּ for רֵ הְיוּ.

a. The number of these marginal readings differs in different editions.
Elias Levita states that there are 848. Others have computed them to
be 1,000; others still, 1,200.

§ 47. Sometimes a different reading from that of the text
is suggested by the points alone without a marginal note
being added in explanation, as when a particular word or
orthography is regularly substituted for another of frequent
occurrence. These cases are presumed to be so familiar to
the reader as to require no other index of their existence
than the presence of the appropriate vowels. Thus, the
divine name יהוה, which the Jews had a superstitious dread
of pronouncing, was and still is read by them as if it were
אֲדֹנָי Lord, whose points it accordingly receives, יְהֹוָה, unless
these two names stand in immediate connection, when, to
avoid repetition, it is read אֱלֹהִים and pointed יֱהֹוִה Gen.
15 : 2, Hab. 3 : 19. The antiquity of this superstition is
attested by the Κύριος of the Septuagint, followed in the
English as well as in other modern versions by the rendering
Lord. The true sound of the name never having been
noted, is now lost; the only clue that is left being its ety-
mology and the form which it assumes in composition,
§ 62. 1, from which the conclusion has been variously drawn
that it was יַהֲוֶה, יַהֲוָה, or יֶהֱוֶה. The common pronunciation
Jehovah is manifestly founded upon the error of combining

the consonants of this word with the vowels of another and
an entirely different one. There is, however, especially as it
is uncertain whether *Yahve* or *Yah^ava*, or either of these, was
its original sound, no good reason for abandoning the pro-
nunciation familiar to the Christian world and hallowed by
the association of constant usage for the sake of adopting
another which is, or is supposed to be, phonetically more
exact, any more than we need be guilty of the pedantry of
preferring *Yeshayahu* to Isaiah because it approaches more
nearly to the original pronunciation of the prophet's name.
Other standing K'ris, unnoted in the margin, are הִוא, the
form of the pronoun of the third person feminine which is
used throughout the Pentateuch; this is designed to be read
הִיא, though the sound indicated by the letters is in all proba-
bility הוא. So יִשָּׁשְׁכָר read יִשָּׂכָר, and יְרוּשָׁלֵַם read יְרוּשָׁלַיִם.

§ 48. In the absence of definite information respecting
the origin and sources of these various readings, it is difficult
to determine with absolute precision the weight to which
they are respectively entitled. The current opinion of the
ablest Hebraists, based upon a careful scrutiny of their in-
ternal character and the relation which ordinarily appears to
subsist between them, is that while the K'ri may perhaps, in
a few cases, correct errors in the K'thibh, and so restore the
original reading, it is in the great majority of instances an
explanatory gloss rather than an emendation. With the rare
exceptions already suggested, the K'thibh is esteemed the
true reading, the object of the K'ri being to remove ortho-
graphical anomalies, secure grammatical uniformity, substi-
tute usual for unusual, prevailing for obsolete words and
forms, and occasionally to introduce euphemistic expressions.
While the K'ri is probably not to be esteemed the original
reading, therefore, it deserves attention as the grammatical
or exegetical comment of a steadfast tradition.

Accuracy of the Points.

§ 49. 1. All the Masoretic additions to the text designed to facilitate its reading have now been considered. The correctness of the pronunciation, which they yield, is vouched for not only by the esteem in which they are universally held by the Jews, but by the scrupulous minuteness of the system, its consistency with itself and with the vowel-letters of the text, its affinity with and yet independence of the vocalization of the kindred languages the Arabic and Syriac, and the veneration for the already established text which evidently characterized its authors, since they did not venture to change the text even in the slightest particular.

2. The only additional information which has come down to us respecting the true sound of Hebrew words, is furnished by the mode of writing proper names in the Septuagint version, and the few Hebrew words preserved by ancient authors, particularly Origen and Jerome. These have been subjected to an elaborate comparison with the Masoretic punctuation, and the result has been to establish their substantial agreement in the main, with, however, not a few remarkable points of divergence. In relation to this subject it should be observed, that the Hebrew pronunciation of the Seventy is inferred entirely from their mode of spelling proper names, not from words in living use in the language. The chances of inaccuracy, on the part of the translators, are here peculiarly great. Many names were not familiar and were of rare occurrence ; and as no system of vowel notation then existed, they were left entirely to their independent knowledge of the sound of each individual word. These words were written by them in a foreign alphabet, whose sounds did not coincide precisely with those of the Hebrew, and in which the proper equivalents varied somewhat according to their combinations. The true sound was also de-

parted from sometimes because the laws of Greek euphony forbade its exact reproduction. The negligence with which they are chargeable elsewhere was also probably aggravated here, and in fact there are many instances in which they not merely deviate from the vowels but transpose or change the letters. Leaving out of view, therefore, such incidental discrepancies as are to be accounted for in the ways now suggested, a thorough and extended examination of the subject reveals, with all the general agreement, a number of regular and systematic deviations.

a. These are thus stated by Ewald, Lehrbuch, p. 116. (1.) An *ĕ* or *ĭ* derived from *ă* is written *ă*, as תֶּרַח Θαρα, בִּלְעָם Βαλααμ, גִּבְעוֹן Γαβαων, מִרְיָם Μαριαμ; and on the other hand, *a* is sometimes written *ĕ*, אָהֳלִיבָמָה Ολιβεμα, קְנַז Κενεζ, גֵּת Γεθ, especially before ח, as קֹרַח Κορε, זֶרַח Ζαρε. (2.) *ĕ* is written for *ĭ* and *ŏ* for *ŭ*, כְּתִים Χετταιοι, גֵיחֹנּ Γεεννα, גִּדְעוֹן Γεδεων, מִצְרַיִם Μεσραιμ, אֲחָזִי Οχοζαθ, עֻזִּיָּה Οζια. (3.) for the diphthongal *ē* and *ō* their constituents *ai* and *au* are substituted, קֵינָן Καιναν, נְבוֹ Ναβαυ. (4.) The vowel letters are softened into their homogeneous vowels וַיִּקְרָא ονικρα, וַיְדַבֵּר ονιδαβηρ. (5.) Vocal Sh'va is written as a full vowel, commonly *a*, or if an *o* follow, *o*, צְבָאוֹת Σαβαωθ, רְעוּאֵל Ραγουηλ, כְּרוּבִים Χερουβιμ, סְדֹם Σοδομα; the final vowel of Segholates is also written *ŏ* if *o* precedes, מֹלֶךְ Μολοχ, עֹמֶר γομορ.

3. The regularity of these deviations seems to be best accounted for by the assumption that the pronunciation represented in the Septuagint is that which prevailed among the Jews in Egypt, which would naturally be less pure than that of Palestine represented in the vowel points, and which, moreover, betrays in the particulars recited above a strong leaning to Aramæan forms and sounds. Accordingly the view now commonly entertained is that the vowel notation of the Masorites is correct, at least in all essential particulars, and that it is properly to be put at the basis of all investigations into the phenomena of the language.

ORTHOGRAPHIC CHANGES.

§ 50. The signs thus far described represent all the sounds of the Hebrew language. Its stock of words is formed by combining these in various significant ways. The laws of such combinations, and especially the mutations to which they are subject, or which they occasion, next demand attention. When a particular idea has been attached to a certain combination of sounds, its different modifications may naturally be expressed by slightly varying those sounds. This may take place,

1. By the substitution of one letter for another of like character, and for the most part of the same organ, e. g.:

הָיָה *to be, exist,* חָיָה *to live ;* נָבַע *to pour forth,* נָבָא the same idea applied to words, *to prophesy ;* עָנַק *to encircle the neck with an ornament,* חָנַק *to strangle,* אָנַק applied to sounds uttered in strangulation, *to groan ;* רָגַל *to go about as a spy,* רָכַל *to go about as a merchant ;* כָּנַס *to collect,* גְּנָזִים *treasures ;* גָּבִיעַ *a cup,* כּוֹבַע or קוֹבַע *a helmet* (of similar shape); רַךְ *tender, delicate,* רַק *thin ;* תָּקַן *to make straight,* תָּכֵן *to straighten the beam of the balance, to weigh ;* בְּכוֹר *first born,* בִּכּוּר *first ripe,* בֹּקֶר *the first portion of the day, the morning ;* תָּלָה *to suspend,* דָּלָה *applied to a bucket, to let down ;* גָּזַר *to cut,* קָצַר *to reap ;* זָהָב *gold,* צָהֹב *yellow ;* טָמַן *to conceal,* שָׂפַן and צָפַן *to hide away* as treasures, סָפַן *to cover with boards ;* נָתַץ *to destroy* by tearing down, נָתַשׁ *to destroy* by uprooting ; טָבַח *to slay,* זָבַח *to sacrifice ;* חָבַל *to bind,* גָּבַל *to bound ;* בָּרַח *to break up, flee,* פָּרַח *to break out, blossom,* פָּרַק *to break in pieces ;* קָצַב *to cut off,* חָצַב *to hew stone,* חָטַב *to cut wood ;* פָּתַר *to surround,* עָטַר *to encircle the head with a crown ;* נָתַךְ *to pour out,* נָסַךְ *to pour in libation or in casting metals ;* צָהַר *to shine,* טָהַר *to be pure ;* חָרַת *to engrave,* חָרַשׁ *to plough ;* בָּחַן *to prove,* בָּחַר *to approve, choose ;* שָׁתָה *to drink,* its causative הִשְׁקָה ; חָתַר *to break through,* חָקַר *to investigate ;* נָצַב *to place,* its reflexive הִתְיַצֵּב.

2. By the transposition of letters, e. g.:

פָּרַץ *to deal violently,* פָּצַר *to urge ;* קָצַר *to cut with the sickle, reap,* קָרַץ *to cut with the teeth, bite ;* נָשַׁף *to blow,* נֶפֶשׁ *breath ;* כָּנַס *to collect,* נֶכֶס *riches,* מִסְכְּנוֹת *storehouses.*

3. By the addition of a letter:

Thus, from the letters צר, in which inheres the idea of compression, are formed צָרַר *to bind,* צוּר *to press together,* אָצַר *to heap up,* יָצַר *to be*

straitened, נָצַר *to guard, besiege,* עָצַר *to restrain,* חָצַר *an enclosure;* from גז are formed גָּזַר *to cut,* גָּרַז *to cut off,* גוּז *to cut loose, go away,* גָּזַז *to shear,* גָּזַל *to plunder,* גָּזִית *hewn stone;* פָּרַשׁ *to unfold, make distinct,* פָּרְשׂוּ *to spread out;* כֶּרֶם *a vineyard,* כַּרְמֶל *a garden.*

§ 51. Such literal changes as those just recited not only serve to express new shades of meaning, but even where the meaning remains precisely the same, they may represent diversities of other sorts. Thus, the distinction may be,

1. In point of currency or style: One form of the word being in more common and familiar use, the other more rare and savoring, perhaps, of the elevated or poetic style, e. g.:

נָצַר *to guard,* נָטַר poetic; בְּרוֹשׁ *cypress,* בְּרוֹת once in poetry; סָגַר *to shut,* rarely סָכַר; סְעָרָה *storm,* שְׂעָרָה rare and poetic; סָכַךְ *to cover,* once שָׂכַךְ: דָּעַךְ *to be quenched,* once זָעַךְ; תָּעַב *to abhor,* once תָּאַב; סָכַל *to be foolish,* once כָּסַל; עַוְלָה *iniquity,* once עַלְוָה.

2. Of antiquity: The pronunciation of a word or its form may undergo changes in the lapse of time. Of the few instances of this sort, which our imperfect data enable us to fix upon with some measure of confidence, the following may be taken as specimens, e. g.:

To laugh in the Pentateuch צָחַק, in other books (Judg. 16:25 excepted) שָׂחַק; *to cry out* in the Pentateuch צָעַק, only once (Ex. 2:23) זָעַק which is the more frequent form in other books; כִּשְׂבָּה *a lamb,* occur in the Pentateuch interchangeably with כֶּבֶשׂ, כִּבְשָׂה, which are the only forms found in other books; *a sceptre* שֵׁבֶט. but in the book of Esther שַׁרְבִיט; *Damascus* דַּמֶּשֶׂק, in Chronicles דַּרְמֶשֶׂק; *how* 1 Chron. 13:12, Dan. 10:17 הֵיךְ, in earlier books אֵיךְ.

3. Of Dialect: The same word may come to be pronounced differently by those who speak distinct though related languages. Thus, the Aramæan dialects, the Chaldee and Syriac, in very many words regularly substitute א for the Hebrew final ה, and the corresponding linguals for the Hebrew sibilants, צ being sometimes still further weakened by the loss even of the lingual sound to that of the guttural ע, e. g.:

Heb. תָּעָה *to wander,* Chald. טְעָא, Syr. ܛܥܐ; Heb. זָהָב *gold,* Chald. דְּהַב, Syr. ܕܗܒܐ; Heb. צוּר *a rock,* Chald. טוּר, Syr. ܛܘܪܐ; Heb. שָׁלשׁ *three,* Chald. תְּלָת, Syr. ܬܠܬ, Arab. ثَلَاث; Heb. אֶרֶץ *the earth,* Arab. أَرْض, Chald. אֲרַע, Syr. ܐܪܥܐ. Other consonant changes: Heb. בֵּן *a son,* Arab. إِبْن, Chald. בַּר, Syr. ܒܪ; Heb. קָטַל *to kill,* Arab. قَتَل; Heb. קְטַל, Syr. ܩܛܠ; Heb. כִּסֵּא *a throne,* Chald. כּוּרְסֵי, Syr. ܟܘܪܣܝܐ, Arab. كُرْسِيّ; Heb. חֶלְקָה *a field,* Chald. חַקְלָא, Syr. ܚܩܠܐ, Eth. ሐቅል :.

4. Of simple euphony: An alternate form of a word may be produced to facilitate its pronunciation or make its sound more pleasing, e. g.:

נְשָׁכָּה, לִשְׁכָּה *chamber;* שָׂטַן, שָׂטַם *to hate;* אַרְגָּמָן, אַרְגְּוָן *purple;* הוֹרֵג, הֹאֵג Nebuchadnezzar; נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר, נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר Achan; עָכָר, עָכָן Doeg; אַלְגּוּמִּים, אַלְמֻגִּים *almug* or *algum trees;* מְתַלְּעוֹת, מַלְתָּעוֹת *teeth.*

a. Mere varieties of orthography must not be mistaken for consonantal changes, e. g. לֹא occasionally for לוֹ and *vice versâ,* probably שִׁכְלוּת for סִכְלוּת, and such permutations of gutturals as abound in the manuscripts of the Samaritans, who, making no distinction in the sounds of these letters, perpetually confounded them in writing, Gesen. Sam. Pent. p. 52. A like faulty pronunciation has been attributed to the Galileans, to which there is a probable allusion in Matt. 26:73. Buxtorf Lex. Chald. p. 434.

§ 52. The changes thus far described result in the production of distinct words, and belong to the domain of the lexicon rather than of the grammar. The lexicographer regards such words as cognate, and traces them back to their common source; but, in the view of the grammarian, they are totally distinct. The mutations with which the latter concerns himself are such as take place in the direct derivation and inflection of words. These are altogether euphonic, are more restricted in their character, and take place within far narrower limits, than those heretofore considered. When words are subjected to grammatical changes their sounds are brought into new connections, attended, it may be, with

a difficulty of utterance which demands some measure of
relief, or they pass readily and naturally into other sounds,
which are easier of pronunciation or more agreeable to the
ear. The mutations thus induced are of three sorts, viz.:
Consonant Changes, the Conversion of Consonants into
Vowels, and Vowel Changes. These will require to be con-
sidered separately.

Consonant Changes.

§ 53. The first class of changes embraces those which
affect the consonants. These mostly arise from the concur-
rence of two consonants, creating a difficulty in the pronun-
ciation or yielding a sound displeasing to the ear. This may
take place either at the beginning or the close of a syllable.
Syllables in Hebrew may, and often do, begin with two con-
sonants, § 18. 1; but the necessity of this is avoided in
certain cases by the following expedients:

1. In the beginning of words the weak letter ה is some-
times prefixed with a short vowel, thus creating a new initial
syllable to which the first consonant may be transferred.

a. The only instances of this are afforded by the second and seventh
conjugations of verbs, the Niphal and Hithpael, e. g. הִקְטֵל = הִנְקְטֵל for
נְקְטֵל; הִתְקַטֵּל probably for תְקַטֵּל § 82. 5. *b.* In אֲדֹרֹשׁ Ezek. 14: 3 א is
prefixed instead of ה. Prosthesis is more common in the domain of the
lexicon, where א is always the letter used, e. g. זְרֹועַ, אֶזְרֹועַ *arm;* תְּמֹול,
אֶתְמֹול *yesterday.* A prefixed א is even occasionally employed to soften
the pronunciation without the necessity stated above, e. g. אֲגַפִּים, אֲבַטִּחִים,
אֲזִקִּים, אַדַרְכְּנִים. So in Chaldee אֲדַם *blood,* Heb. דָּם; אֲגַן *garden,* Heb.
גַּן. In Arabic the concurrence of two consonants at the beginning of a
word is regularly obviated by prefixing ا. Comp. Greek χθές, ἐχθές.

2. The first of the concurrent consonants, if it has a
comparatively feeble sound, is sometimes dropped.

a. This occurs regularly in verbs whose first radical is י or נ, and in nouns derived from such verbs, e. g. בּוּל for יָבַל, רְדָה for יָרַד, שֵׁב for יָשַׁב, נְחִי for נָחָה, Ezek. 2:10 for חַשְׁמַל Ezek. 1:4 for נְחֻשְׁמַל, and חֵן for נָתַן, הֵי for יֻבָל, perhaps פָּאֹר Am. 8:8 for פְּיָאֹר.

א is thus dropped in נָחְנוּ for אֲנַחְנוּ, שֶׁ for אֲשֶׁר; also in a few instances from the beginning of the second syllable of words, e. g. וָאֹבְדָךְ Ezek. 28:16 for וָאַאַבֶּדְךָ; הַסּוּרִים Eccl. 4:14 for הָאֲסוּרִים; אָזִין Job 32:11 for אַאֲזִין; מָסֹרֶת Ezek. 20:37 for מַאֲסֹרֶת; הָרַמִּים 2 Chron. 22:5 for הָאֲרַמִּים; אֱהָב Prov. 8:17 for מֵאֲכֹלֶת 1 Kin. 5:25 with Daghesh-forte conservative for מַאֲכֹלֶת; מֵזִין Prov. 17:4 for מַאֲזִין; שְׁלָתֵךְ 1 Sam. 1:17 for אֵאֱהָב for אֱהָב; שְׁאֵלָתֵךְ. These examples likewise admit of a different explanation; א may give up its consonantal power, losing its sound in that of the preceding vowel, agreeably to §57. 2 (2), after which it may readily be dropped altogether.

מ is occasionally dropped from the participles of the Pual or fourth conjugation, as לְקָח for מְלֻקָּח; ל in קַח for לְקַח; ה in לַבַּת Ex. 3:2 for לְהַבַּת; לָטֵיהֶם Ex. 7:22 for לַהֲטֵיהֶם Ex. 7:11; and perhaps כ in סוּתֹה Gen. 49:11, which appears to be for כְּסוּתֹה.

b. The rejection of a consonant from the beginning of a syllable, when not immediately followed by another consonant, is exceptional; as לֻד Judg. 9:11 for יָלַד; תַּתָּה 2 Sam. 22:41 for נָתַתָּה; חַד Ezek. 33:30 for אֶחָד; הֶחֳדַלְתִּי Judg. 9:9 for הֶחֳדָלְתִּי, and הָאַשְׁפֹּת Neh. 3:13 for הָאַשְׁפֹּת; and perhaps שֹׁוב Jer. 42:10, which seems to be for יָשֹׁוב.

3. The second consonant is sometimes dropped, if it is a letter of feeble sound.

a. This is regularly the case with ה of the article and of verbal prefixes, and י as the final radical of verbs, e. g. לַבַּיִת for לְהַבַּיִת; יִקְטֹל for יְהַקְטֵל; גָּלוּ for גָּלְיוּ.

It occurs besides in a few sporadic examples with these same letters, and more rarely still with א, ו, and ע, e. g. זוּ for זְהוּ, נִי Ezek. 2:10 for נְחִי, יֹושָׁפָט for יְהֹושָׁפָט, and קְטַלְתּוּ and יִקְטְלֶנּוּ with Daghesh-forte conservative for יִקְטְלֶנְהוּ and קְטַלְתָּהוּ; וַיַּדּוּ Lam. 3:53 for וַיְרַדּוּ, הֲרוֹנֵךְ Gen. 3:16 for הֶרְיוֹנֵךְ; מַלְפֵנוּ Job 35:11 for מְאַלְּפֵנוּ, תֻּמִּים Ex. 26:24 for תְּאוֹמִים, וַתַּזְרֵנִי 2 Sam. 22:40 for וַתְּאַזְּרֵנִי; כִּי Isa. 3:24 for יַהֵל Isa. 13:20 for יֶאֱהַל, וְאֶהֱל; בִּי as a particle of entreaty, probably for בְּעִי; יָמִים for יְמָמִים, עִיר for עֲיִיר, עִיר for פְּיָאֹר Am. 8:8 (K'thibh) for וְנִשְׁקָה; בֵּל the name of a Baby-lonish deity for בַּעַל is a foreign contraction. נשקה for בֵּיר, The conjecture that בִּכּוּ Mic. 1:10 is for בְּעַכּוֹ *in Accho* is ingenious and favoured by the occurrence of בְּגַת *in Gath* in the parallel clause; but it is at variance with the points, which, upon this hypothesis, should be בַּכּוֹ.

b. In rare cases this rejection occurs even after a mixed syllable, whose final consonant is thus drawn forward, e. g. אָמָה for אֲמָהֹה, חֶמָה Job 29:6 for חֶמְאָה, תֵּתַצַּב Ex. 2:4 for תִּתְיַצַּב and probably אֶסָּק Ps. 139:8 with Daghesh-forte conservative for אֶסְלָק.

§ 54. When the concurrence takes place at the close of a syllable, whether the second consonant belongs to the same syllable with the first as at the end of words, or to a differ-ent syllable as in the middle of words, the following changes may be produced.

1. An aspirate following another consonant loses its aspiration, § 21; or if it be brought into juxtaposition with its like so as to form a doubled letter, the aspiration of both will be removed, § 23. 2, unless the combination occurs at the end of a word, where the reduplication is not expressed, § 25. Thus, מֵת for מֵתְתְּ , מַתָּ ; הִתְתַּמֵּם for הִתַּמֵּם , לִבְהֶן for לִבְּהֶן , but רַב from רָבַב , רְבַב , מְשָׁרֵת 1 Kin. 1 : 15 for מְשָׁרֶתֶת or מִשָׁרְתְּ , מַחֲבַת Ezek. 4 : 3 for מַחֲבַתְּ , מְשָׁחַת Mal. 1 : 14 for מָשְׁחֶתֶת .

2. The first of two concurring consonants is in certain cases assimilated to the second, the doubling thus occasioned being expressed as in the case of letters originally alike by Daghesh-forte, except at the end of words, § 25, where Daghesh disappears or is only virtually present, being re-sumed upon the addition of a fresh vowel or syllable. This is most frequently the case with the liquid נ , rarely with ל and ר and only in particular words; so ת of the Hithpael of verbs before ד and ט , and in a few instances before sibi-lants and other letters, and ד at the end of a few words before ת . Thus, יִקַּח for יִלְקַח , מַנְתַּנְת for מַתַּת , יִנְתֵּן for יִתֵּן ; יִדַּכְּאוּ ; אֲשֶׁר לִי for שֶׁלִּי ; כַּלְנֵה Am. 6 : 2 ; כַּנֶּה Ezek. 27 : 23 for תִּשׁוֹמֵם for הִתְזַדּוּ for הִזְדּוּ , יִתְטַמָּא for יִטַּמָּא , יִתְדַּכְּאוּ for אַחַת , לָדְתְּ for לַת ; תִּתְכַּסֶּה for תִּכַּסֶּה , הִתְנַבָּאוּ for הִנַּבָּאוּ , תִּתְשׁוֹמֵם for אֲחַדְתְּ .

a. So perhaps כ in מִכָּה according to Gesenius for מִכְבָּה and מַס for מַכְס . Compare Greek συγγενής for συνγενής, τέτυμμαι for τέτυπμαι, and Eng. *il-logical, ir-religion, im-mature* formed by the negative prefix *in*.

3. A few isolated cases occur of the reverse process more common in Chaldee and Syriac, by which a doubled letter is resolved into two different consonants by the change of the

first or the second member of the reduplication to a liquid ר or נ, e. g. מְכַרְבָּל for מְכַבָּל, דַּרְמֶשֶׂק for דַּמֶּשֶׂק, מְעֲזְנֶיהָ Isa. 23 : 11 for מְעֻזֶּיהָ, קִנְצֵי Job 18 : 2 in the judgment of some for קִצֵּי *ends*, though others make the נ a radical, and give the word the sense of *snares*. The conjecture that תַּמְנוּ Ps. 64 : 7, Lam. 3 : 22 is for תַּמּוּ is unnecessary and unwarranted.

4. When ת of the Hithpael of verbs would stand before a sibilant, it is transposed with ס and שׁ, and with צ it is in addition changed to ט. Thus, יִשְׁתַּמֵּר for יִתְשַׁמֵּר, מִסְתַּתֵּר for מִתְסַתֵּר, נִצְטַדָּק for נִתְצַדָּק. יִתְשָׁעֵר for יִשְׁתָּעֵר, יִתְשַׁמֵּר.

a. In הִתְשׁוֹטַטְנָה Jer. 49 : 3 the transposition does not take place in consequence of the number of similar letters which would thus be brought into proximity. In the cognate languages ת is likewise transposed with ז and changed to ד: thus, Chald. הִזְדַּמַּן for הִתְזַמַּן; so, also, in Syriac and Arabic. The only example of a Hebrew verb whose first letter is ז appearing in this conjugation is הִזַּכּוּ Isa. 1 : 16, where ת is assimilated agreeably to 2. Compare with these transpositions the frequent Doric change of ζ (= δσ) into σδ, as συρίσδω for συρίζω.

§ 55. The occurrence of a consonant at the end of a word may, inasmuch as the succeeding word must necessarily begin with one, be regarded as an additional case of the concurrence of consonants. As the contact is less close, however, than when they meet in the same word, it is less fruitful of changes than in the cases already considered.

1. There are three instances in which it has been doubtfully conjectured that a final ן has been assimilated to a following initial מ; viz. יְשֻׂשׂוּם Isa. 35 : 1 presumed to be for יְשֻׂשׂוּן; פִּדְיוֹם Num. 3 : 49 for פִּדְיוֹן Ex. 21 : 30, Ps. 49 : 9; סֻלָּם Gen. 28 : 12.

a. Final consonants are in Sanskrit perpetually modified by the initial letter of the following word. But it is by no means clear that this is so in Hebrew, even in the examples alleged, as the forms admit of a different explanation. See in regard to the first passage, Dr. Alexander's Commentary.

2. A few cases occur of the rejection of a letter, chiefly ן and מ, from the end of a word.

a. ן of the verbal endings וּן and יִן, is almost always dropped, being only retained as an archaic or emphatic form, and chiefly at the end of a clause, e. g. יֵרְדֻּן Deut. 8 : 16, but mostly יֵרְדוּ; תְּדַבְּרוּן Gen. 32:20, commonly תְּדַבְּרוּ; תַּעֲשִׂין Ruth 3 : 4, commonly תַּעֲשִׂי. So, too, in some proper nouns, מִגְדּוֹן Zech. 12:11, מְגִדּוֹ Josh. 12 : 21; שִׁילוֹ, whose original ן is shown in the derivative שִׁילֹנִי and is perpetuated in the modern name *Seilûn.*

b. In like manner מ is rejected from the dual and plural terminations of nouns upon their entering into the close connection of the construct state with the following word, אָזְנֵי from אָזְנַיִם, בָּתֵּי from בָּתִּים.

c. If the feminine endings תְ and הָ have, as is probable, a common origin, this may be best explained by the assumption that ת is in many cases rejected from the termination, leaving only the vowel, though it is always retained when any addition is made to the word: thus, the construct state חָכְמַת, absolute חָכְמָה, but with a suffix חָכְמָתִי; קָטְלָה (comp. אָזְלַת Deut. 32 : 36), קְטָלַתְנִי. It is to be observed here, that this phenomenon does not establish the possibility of an interchange between the consonants ה and ת, because ה in this case represents not *h* but the vowel *ā*.

§ 56. A few other changes remain to be mentioned which are due to special causes.

1. Nun is often inserted in certain forms of verbal suffixes to prevent the hiatus between two vowels, יַעַבְרֶנְהוּ Jer. 5 : 22, or § 53. 3. *a.* יַעַבְרֶנּוּ Isa. 33 : 21 for יַעַבְרֵהוּ, אֲרוֹמְמֶנְהוּ Ex. 15 : 2 for אֲרוֹמְמֵהוּ. Comp. Gr. ἀνόσιος and English indefinite article *an.*

2. Vav at the beginning of words is changed to י, e. g. וְקָטַל for יִקְטֹל, יָלַד for וָלַד, יָעַד for וָעַד. The only exceptions are the four words רָו, רָזָה Prov. 21 : 8, וָלָד Gen. 11 : 30, וָלָד 2 Sam. 6 : 23 (K'ri), and the prefixes Vav Conjunctive and Vav Conversive.

3. Vav, though capable of being reduplicated, e. g. אַוֶּד is in most instances relieved from this necessity by the substitution of י, or by doubling the following letter in its stead, e. g. אָקִים or אֲקֹמֵם for אֲקֹם.

a. In one instance after such a change of ו to י, a following י suffers the contrary change to ו to prevent the triple recurrence of the same letter, אֲרַוֶּךָ Isa. 6:9 for אֲרַיֶּךָ.

4. Yodh before the plural termination ־ים is in a few cases changed to א to prevent the conjunction of like sounds, תְּלוּאָים Hos. 11:7 for תְּלוּיִם Josh. 10:26; צְבוֹאִים Hos. 11:8 for צְבֹיִם Gen. 10:19; הוּדָאִים from הוּדַי; בְּלוֹאֵי Jer. 38:12 for בְּלֹיֵי (or as some read, בְּלוֹיֵי) ver. 11.

a. In like manner ו is changed to א before ־וֹת in the word נָאוֹת for נָווֹת from נָוֶה; it is consequently unnecessary to assume, as Gesenius does, a singular נָאָה which never occurs.

CHANGE OF CONSONANTS TO VOWELS.

§ 57. The second class of changes is the conversion of consonants into vowels, or the substitution of the latter for the former. This occurs,

1. Occasionally in reduplicated syllables or letters, כּוֹכָב for צְלָחוֹת Gen. 11:9; בִּלְבֵּל for בָּבֶל; טַפְטָפֹת for טוֹטָפֹת; כַּבְכָּב for 2 Chron. 35:13 from צַלַּחַת Prov. 19:24.

2. Much more frequently with the quiescents.

(1) A prefixed וְ is softened to its homogeneous vowel *ū* before other labials or vowelless letters, e. g. וּדְבַר, וּבֵית; the softening of an initial י to *ī* only occurs in אִישַׁי 1 Chron. 2:13 for יִשַׁי ver. 12, אִשׁ 2 Sam. 14:19, Mic. 6:10 for יֵשׁ.

(2) Medial or final quiescents without vowels of their own often lose their sound in that of a preceding vowel. This is invariably the case with ו and י following their homogeneous vowels, e. g. הוּרַד for הָוְרַד § 59, בִּיהוּדָה for בְּיְהוּדָה, unless they are doubled, as צַוָּה, מִיִּשְׁנַי, and occasionally even

then, e. g. מִימֵי for מִיְמֵי . Final א always, and medial א frequently, gives up its consonant sound after any vowel whatever, e. g. מָצָא , מְצֹא , מֹצֵאת for מֹצְאֵת .

a. Medial א regularly loses its consonantal power in the future Kal of Pe Aleph verbs, e. g. יֹאכַל ; in אָמַר preceded by ל, thus לֵאמֹר ; in אֱלֹהִים and certain forms of אָדוֹן preceded by the prefixes ו כ ל ב, thus, לֵאלֹהִים, but לֵאלֹהוּ ; לֵאלוֹהַ, לַאדֹנִי but לַאדֹנָיו, לַאדֹנֵי, לַאדוֹן but לַאדֹנֵי, לַאדֹנֵינוּ. The following examples are of a more individual character, e. g. נָאוֶה for נָאֲוֶה, וָאֶצֶּלָה 1 Kin. 11:39 for וָאֲצַלֶּה, הָאסְפֻסֻף Num. 11:4, בָּאזְקִים Jer. 40:1, שֵׁאשְׁאָתִיהָ Isa. 14:23. In a few cases this has led to a change of orthography, the א which is no longer heard being dropped, or another vowel letter substituted for it, e. g. יוּכְלוּ Ezek. 42:5, and אוֹכִיל Hos. 11:4 from אָכַל, רִישׁוֹן Job 8:8 for רִאשׁוֹן, רוֹשׁ Deut. 32:32 for רֹאשׁ, and the examples cited § 53. 2, *a.*

b. The consonant ה never loses its sound in that of a preceding vowel like the rest of the quiescents. The letter ה is often used to denote a vowel, but if in any word it properly expresses a consonant this is never converted into a vowel, or *vice versâ.* The exceptions are apparent not real, as in the frequent abbreviation of the ending יָהוּ in proper names to יָה, thus חִזְקִיָּהוּ, חִזְקִיָּה, יָה. The change here does not consist in the rejection of the vowel וּ and the softening of the consonant ה, but the syllable הוּ is dropped, whereupon final Kamets is written by its appropriate vowel letter, § 11. 1, *a,* just as מִיכָיְהוּ after the rejection of יָהוּ becomes מִיכָה. So in those rare cases in which ה is substituted for the suffix הָ, e. g. שְׂעָרָה Lev. 13:4 for שְׂעָרָהּ. The proper name פְּדַהְאֵל Num. 34:28 is derived not from פָּלָה but פָּדָה, a root of kindred meaning, of whose existence, though otherwise unattested, this word is itself a sufficient voucher.

(3) Medial א often gives its vowel to a preceding vowelless letter and rests in its sound ; י occasionally does the same with a homogeneous vowel, when preceded by a vowelless prefix.

a. Thus, א : רָאשִׁים for רְאָשִׁים, חֲטָאת for חֲטָאָת ; שָׁאטְךָ Ezek. 25:6 from שָׁאַט ver. 15 ; נְשׂוּא Ps. 139:20 for נָשׂוּא, so יִרְפָּאוּ Jer. 10:5 ; רְאוּבֵנִי from רְאוּבֵן ; בּוֹדְאָם Neh. 6:8 for בּוֹדְאָם ; תֹּוא Isa. 51:20, תְּאוֹ Deut. 14:5 ; וָאֶעֱשֹׂר ; כָּאבִּיר Isa. 10:13 for כָּאבִּיר ; חְטָאִים 1 Sam. 14:33 for חֹטְאִים ; וְאֶעֱשֹׁר Zech. 11:5 for וְאַעֲשֵׁר ; this even occurs after mixed syllables, e. g. מְלַאכָה for מַלְאָכָה ; וַנָּאץ for וַנְּאִיץ ; לִקְרַאת for לִקְרֹאת, particularly in proper nouns יִזְרְעֵאל for יִזְרֶעֵאל, יִשְׁמְעֵאל for יִשְׁמָעֵאל. So, פִּתְרוֹנִי Eccles. 2:13 for פִּתְרוֹן ; וְיִלְלַת Jer. 25:36 for וְיִלְלַת ; לִיקְהַת Prov. 30:17 for לִיקְּהַת. There is no instance of this with י, on the contrary, קְוֻצּוֹת Cant. 5:2, 12.

(4) At the end of words ו and י, when without a vowel of their own and preceded by a vowelless letter, invariably

quiesce in their homogeneous vowels, ו in an unaccented *ū*, י in *ī*, which draws the accent upon itself and frequently causes the dissolution of a previous syllable and the rejection of its vowel, בֹּהוּ for בְּהוּ, בָּחֹן for בְּחֹן, יִשְׁתַּחוּ for יִשְׁתַּחֲוֻ; יִשְׁתַּדְּרוּן for יְהִי, יְהִי for יֶהֱוִי; פְּרִי, יִחְיְן for פְּרָי, דָּמִי for דְּמָי.

(5) When preceded or accompanied by heterogeneous vowels, ו and י are sometimes dropped, or if the vowel be *a*, they not unfrequently combine with it, forming the diphthongal *o* and *e*, § 62. 1, e. g. הֻצַּק for הֻוְצַק, הֻרְצַק for גָּלֹה, גָּלָה for גְּלֹי, הוֹשִׁיב for מֵת for מֶוֶת; מֵת for הַקְוֹרִים, הַקֹּרִים for הֵקִים, קָם for קָוַם, גֵּל for גְּלִי, בַּיִת const. בֵּית const. of מָוֶת, מֹות construct state of נִדְלַשׁ for נִדְלַשׁ, קָדֹשׁ for הַוְשִׁיב, הַוְשִׁיב יִגְלֶה for יִגְלַי, הַיְלִיל, הֵילִיל for הַיְלִיל, בֵּית of.

a. Vav rarely remains with a heterogeneous vowel unless accompanied by weak letters, by contrast with which it becomes comparatively strong, e. g. רָוַח, עִוֵּר, הֶוֶה.

VOWEL CHANGES.

§ 58. 1. The third class of changes embraces those which take place in the vowels. The primary office of the vowels is to aid in pronouncing the consonants, to which consequently they are quite subordinate, merely occupying, so to speak, the interstices between them. Their number and variety being greater, however, than is demanded for this single purpose, they have besides to a certain extent an independent value and meaning of their own in the constitution of words. (1) Changes of vowels, while they cannot like a difference of consonants create distinct verbal roots, are yet fruitful of those minor modifications of which etymology takes cognizance, such as the formation of derivatives and grammatical inflexions, e. g. גָּדֵל *to be great*, גֹּדֶל *greatness*, גָּדֹול *great;* קָטַל *he killed*, קְטֹול *to kill*, קְטֹל *kill thou*, קֹטֵל *killing*, קָטוּל *killed;* סוּס *a horse*, סוּסָה *a mare*. (2) They may indicate differences in the forms of words which have

arisen in the lapse of time; נַעַר in the Pentateuch means indifferently *girl* or *boy*, in later books *girl* is נַעֲרָה; הוּא in the Pentateuch *he* or *she*, in other books *she* is always הִיא; the form of the demonstrative הַלָּזֶה is found only in Genesis, הַלָּז in writers after the time of Moses, הַלָּזוּ in Ezekiel; the plural of the demonstrative in the Pentateuch אֵל or אֵלֶּה, elsewhere, with a single exception, אֵלֶּה. The imperfect notation of the vowels in the original mode of writing by letters alone has, however, left us without the means of ascertaining to what extent such changes may have taken place. (3) They may indicate diversity of dialect, e. g. קָטַל *to kill*, Chald. קְטַל, Syr. ܩܰܛܶܠ, Arab. قَتَلَ, Ethiop. ፈተለ:.

2. The vowel changes with which orthography is concerned, on the other hand, are purely euphonic, being in themselves void of significance, and springing solely from the natural preference for what is easier of utterance or more agreeable to the ear. Orthographically considered, vowels are either mutable or immutable, the latter being unaffected by those circumstances which occasion changes in the former. A vowel may be immutable by nature, or made so by position. A short vowel in a mixed syllable before the accent is ordinarily immutable by position, being beyond the reach of the common causes of mutation, e. g. מִשְׁפָּחָה, מִדְבָּר. Long vowels are immutable by nature in certain words or classes of words; but they are only distinguishable as such by a knowledge of the etymological forms which require them. It may, however, be observed, as a general though not an invariable rule, that the vowels of such words and forms as are prevailingly written with the vowel letters are less liable to mutation than those which are prevailingly written without them. Mutable vowels are liable to changes both of quantity, from long to short, and the reverse, and of quality from pure to mixed (*u* to *o*, *i* to *e*, *a* to *ĕ*) and the reverse, these changes being confined, except in rare in-

stances, to the cognate forms; thus, *i* never passes into *u* or *o*, nor these into *a*. Only as *ĕ* stands in relation to both *i* and *a*, it serves to mediate the interval between them, and thus accounts for the occasional changes of *i* to *a* or the reverse, e. g. הִקְטִיל , הִקְטַלְתָּ ; בַּת for בְּנֵת , בִּתִּי ; דָּם , דְּמֵכֶם comp. יָד , יֶדְכֶם .

a. The exceptional change from *u* or *o* to *e* occurs only in the pronouns, e. g. קְטַלְתֶּם , before suffixes קְטַלְתּוּ ; and in the particle אֵת , before suffixes אֹת . There are also a few examples of the change of short vowels in mixed syllables before the accent, e. g. מֶרְכָּבָה , construct מִרְכֶּבֶת , plural מַרְכְּבוֹת .

§ 59. The mutations of vowels are due to one or other of the following causes, viz.: 1. Syllabic changes. 2. The influence of consonants. 3. The influence of vowels. 4. The accent. 5. The shortening or lengthening of words. As the vowel of unaccented mixed syllables is always short, and that of simple syllables long, § 18. 2, it is evident that a change in the character of a syllable will involve a corresponding change in its vowel, unless the accent interfere to prevent. Accordingly, when for any cause a mixed syllable becomes simple, its short vowel will be converted into a long one; and when a simple syllable becomes mixed, the reverse change will take place, e. g. קָמָה , קָמְתָּ ; הָרִים , הַר . In the case of the vowels *i* and *u* there is frequently an additional change of quality, viz., of *ĭ* to *ē* and *ŭ* to *ō*, e. g. הֵקִים for הִקְרִים ; כּוֹנַן for כֻּרְנַן in place of כֻּן § 56. 3.

a. Daghesh-forte is thus resolved by the prolongation of the previous vowel in קָמוֹשׁ , מוֹרִגִּים , מוֹרִיגִים ; הֲמִישִׁי , הֲמִישִׁי , חֲמִשִׁי ; פֶּלֶגֶשׁ , פִּילֶגֶשׁ , קִרְמוֹשׁ , קְמוֹשׁ ; הִתְפָּקְדוּ for הִתְפָּקְדוּ § 33. 2. *a* ; מִרְקָשִׁים Eccles. 9:12 for יוּקָשִׁים ; חוּקוֹ , חֻקּוֹ , חֻקּוֹ ; נִילָה Lam. 1:8. if this is for נִדָּה see ver. 17; and if the conjecture of Gesenius (Thesaurus, p. 483) be correct as to the true reading in 1 Chron. 23:6, 24:3 יְחַלְּקֵם for יְחַלְּקֵם .

§ 60. Contiguous consonants may give rise to vowel changes by their individual peculiarities, as is the case with

the gutturals, or by their concurrence. The peculiarities of the gutturals are fourfold, viz. :

1. A preference for the vowel Pattahh of the same organ, into which, consequently, a preceding or accompanying vowel is frequently converted, e. g. שָׁלַח for שָׁלֵח; פַּעַם for פַּעֵם; יִגְבַּהּ for יִגְבַּהּ; שָׁמַע for שָׁמֵע; שָׂנֵאָהּ from שָׂנֵא.

a. The instances in which this permutation occurs cannot easily be embraced under any general rules. In some cases it was optional; in others, usage decides for it or against it without, however, being absolutely uniform. The following statements embrace what is of most importance. (1) The stability of the vowel often depends upon the weight attached to it in the etymological form ; thus, שְׁמַע in the imperative but not in the infinitive for שְׁמֹע; רְשָׁמֵעַ for רְשָׁמֵעַ, but שֹׁמֵעַ not שֹׁמַע for שֹׁמֵעַ. (2) The vowel preceding the guttural is more liable to change than that which succeeds it, e. g. רְשָׁמֵעַ always, but תִּמְעַל and תִּמְעֹל; וַתֵּנַח but וַתָּחָס; זַעֲקוּ but עָמְדוּ. (3) An accented vowel is sometimes retained where one unaccented would suffer change, e. g. רַחֵל but נֹּחַן; וַיִּחַר; לֶחֶם. (4) *O* and *u* are less subject to alteration than *i* and *e*, e. g. פֹּעַל for פֹּעֵל; *ā* which is already cognate with the gutturals is mostly retained, though it occasionally becomes *ă* before ח, e. g. אַחִים from אָח, מִבְטַחִי Job 31:24 (in most copies) from מִבְטָח, יֻמַּח from יִמְחֶה. (5) א in many cases prefers the diphthongal vowels *e* and *o*, thus אֶקְטֹל, נִמְצָאתִי, תִּמְצָאןָ, יֵאָסֵר but רֶאֹסְרוּ; יֹאכַל, יָבֹא. (6) ר partakes of this preference for *ă* to a limited extent, e. g. וַיַּרְא from יִרְאֶה; וַיִּסֹר or וַיִּסַּר for וַיָּסַר.

2. The reception of Pattahh furtive, § 17, at the end of a word after a long heterogeneous vowel (i. e. any other than *a*), or before a vowelless final consonant, e. g. נֹחַ, רֵעַ, תַּגְבִּיהַ, יָנוּחַ, רָגַעְתָּ.

a. This is necessary when the vowel preceding a final guttural cannot be converted into Pattahh. Sometimes the form with Pattahh and that with Pattahh furtive occur interchangeably. e. g. לְשַׁלֵּחַ and לְשַׁלַּח, or with a slight distinction, as אֲשַׁלַּח, in pause אֲשַׁלֵּחַ: ; מִזְבֵּחַ, construct מִזְבַּח. In a few instances a guttural preceding a final vowelless letter takes simple Sh'va instead of Pattahh furtive, e. g. לְקַחְתְּ 1 Kin. 14:3, and in most editions שָׁבְחֵךְ Jer. 13:25. As final א is always either quiescent or otiant, it never receives Pattahh furtive. The letter ר never takes it unless it be in a single instance, and that in a penultimate syllable יִרְדֹּף Ps. 7:6, which is probably to be read *yiᵃrdōph ;* though it might be pronounced *yiraddōph,* which some conceive to be an anomalous form for יִרְדֹּף, after the analogy of יִצְחָק Gen. 21:6, the compound Sh'va being lengthened into a vowel followed by euphonic Daghesh, as in the related words

6

חֲבוּרָה Isa. 1:6, and חַבֻּרָה Isa. 53:5, while others adopt the explanation of the old Jewish Grammarians, that it is a peculiar combination of the Kal יְרֻׁם and the Piel יְרֻׁם.

3. A preference for compound rather than simple Sh'va, § 16. 3, whether silent or vocal, inasmuch as the gutturals are more readily made audible at the beginning than at the close of a syllable, and the hiatus accompanying them assumes more of the complexion of a vowel than is usual with stronger consonants.

a. The gutturals occasionally retain simple Sh'va when silent. This is regularly done by a final radical ה, ח or ע, followed by a servile letter, e. g. מִשְׁפַּחְתּוֹ, מִשְּׁמַעְתֶּם, יְדַעְתֶּם, יְדַעֲנוּ, גָּבְהְתָּ, with few exceptions as וִידַעְתִּי Hos. 8:2, נְגַעֲנוּךָ Gen. 26:29, הוֹקַעֲנוּם 2 Sam. 21:6. Other cases have more of a casual or sporadic character, and occur chiefly with the stronger gutturals ה and ח, מַחְשְׁבוֹת, הִתְיַחְשׂוּ, תַּחְבֹּל, יִחְיֶה, יֶחְפַּךְ, נֶחְפַּךְ, יִחְפָּה, נַחֲלָה but מַחְשְׁבוֹת, יַחֲבֹשׁ but יַחְבְּשׁוּ, נַחֲלָה *a possession*, but נַחְלָה from נַחַל *a brook;* more rarely with א and ע, נֶעֱלָם Lev. 4:13, בִּנְשָׂא 1 Kin. 15:16, בַּעֲלָם Isa. 11:15, שַׂעֲרָה Deut. 25:7 but in pause שַׂעֲרָה: Isa. 28:6, נֶאְדָּרִי Ex. 15:6; ר has for the most part simple Sh'va יְגָרְשֵׁם, רְבֹת, though in a few instances it has compound וַיְבָרֲכֵהוּ, בֵּרֲכוֹ.

b. (1) Among the compound Sh'vas the preference, unless there is some reason for choosing another, is ordinarily given to Hhateph Pattahh, as the simplest and most in accordance with the nature of the gutturals, and to this an antecedent Hhirik, when unessential to the form, is commonly made to correspond, e. g. יַעֲמֹד, עֲמֹד for עֲמֹד. Sometimes, particularly with א (see 1. *a.* 5.) Hhateph Seghol is taken אֱמֶת, אֱוִלָה, אֱמוּנָה, אֱלֹהוּת, יֶאֱחֹזֵךְ Jer. 13:21, which עָרוּךְ Joel 2:5, עֱנוּת, עֱזוּז, חֱרִיתֶם, אֱדוֹם, אֱמֹר not infrequently becomes Hhateph Pattahh upon the prolongation of the word אֱמֹר, אֲמָר־ Prov. 25:7, אֲמָתוֹ, אֲדֹמִי, יַאֲחֹזוּהוּ Judg. 10:2, or the carrying forward of its accent וְהַחֲרַמְתִּי, הֶחֱרַמְתִּי, וְהַאֲבַדְתִּי, הֶאֱבַדְתִּי.

(2) If, however, *ĭ* or *ŏ*, characteristic of the form, precede, this commonly determines the Sh'va to be selected. e. g. יַעֲמֹד for עֲמֹד, הַעֲמִיד for הֶעֱמִיד, פָּעֳלִי for פָּעֳלִי; though sometimes Hhateph Pattahh is retained and the intermediate syllable, § 20. 2, resolved into a simple one by prolonging the vowels, e. g. הֶעֱבַרְתָּ Josh. 7:7, הָעֳלָה, פָּעֳלוּ Isa. 1:31. Hhirik may, however, remain short, e. g. שְׁחֲרוּ, שֶׁעֲשׁוּעַ, תֶּחֱלָךְ Job 6:22, particularly if a Daghesh-forte has been omitted from the guttural, e. g. נִאֲפָה Jer. 3:8, though even in this case the assimilation sometimes takes place, e. g. יֶחֱמוּ Gen. 30:39 for יֶחֱמוּ, אַחֲרוּ Judg. 5:28 for אֶחֱרוּ. If a vowel has been rejected from the form, the corresponding Hhateph is generally preferred, e. g. תִּשְׁתַּחֲוִי, חֲדָשִׁים, עָפָר Ezek. 16:33, רְאִי Gen. 16:13; הֵשִׁיבוּ 1 Kin. 13:20 from הֵשִׁיב; הֱשִׁיבוּ Gen. 37:22 from הֵשִׁיב. There are occasional instances of the same word being variously written in this respect, e. g. אָחוֹר Ruth 3:15, אָחֹזוּ Cant. 2:15; יִתְאָרֲהוּ and

וְיִתְאָרֵהוּ Isa. 44 : 13 ; חֲמַרְמְרוּ Job 16 : 16 (K'ri in some copies), חֳמַרְמָרוּ Lam. 1 : 20, תֳּאֲרוֹ Isa. 52 : 14, תֳּאֲרוֹ 1 Sam. 28 : 14.

c. Before another guttural the compound Sh'va is frequently replaced by the corresponding short vowel, e. g. הַאֵלֶךְ for הֶאֱלֶךְ, הֶעִידֹתִי for הַעֲחֵרֶם, הֶאֲחַרְתִּי for הַאֲחֵרִים ; and occasionally under א by a long vowel before other letters as well as gutturals. or by a short vowel with Daghesh, e. g. אֵזוֹר for אֱזוֹר, אֵבוּס for אֲבוּס, אֳרְחֹתָיו, אֱהָלִים for אֹהָלִים, אִסָּר for אֱסָר. This disposition to render the gutturals more audible by the aid of a vowel is further shown by their attracting to themselves the vowel of another letter, particularly in triliteral monosyllables, e. g. זֶרַע for זֶרַע, בֹּאֵר for בֹּאֵר, (זֶרַע,) קֹחַת, מֵעַט, נֵטַע, תֵּשַׁע 2 Kin. 12 : 9, בֹּאֹשׁ for בֹּאֹשׁ, also קְרָאן Ex. 2 : 20 for קְרָאן Ruth 1 : 20, תֶּאֱהֲבוּ Prov. 1 : 22 for תֶּאֱהֲבוּ, וָאֶסְעָרֵם Zech. 7 : 14 for וָאֶסְעָרֵם, and by תֹּאכְלֵהוּ Job 20 : 26 for תֹּאכְלֵהוּ, their sometimes causing an antecedent or accompanying vowel to be retained where analogy would require its rejection, e. g. מוֹצָאֵי for מוֹצָאֵי from בָּחוּר comp. בָּחוּרִים and סְרִיסֵי, סָרִיסַי, מַטָּעֵי, הֶחְטִיא, מוֹצָא, from 1. *a.* (4), יִמְצָאֵהוּ Deut. 32 : 10 ; תְּעָלַת, מְעָלַת.

4. An incapacity for being doubled, whence they never receive Daghesh-forte, and the previous syllable thus becoming a simple one, its vowel is generally lengthened, § 59, *ă* to *ā*, *ĭ* to *ē*, *ŭ* to *ō*, e. g. מָאֵן for מֵאֵן, מֵאֵן for מִאֵן, יְבֹרַךְ for תֵּעָזֵב, אֵחֹר, יְבֹרַךְ.

a. Sometimes an intermediate syllable, § 20. 2, is formed, and the vowel remains short. (1) This is commonly the case before ח, frequently before ה, less often before ע, rarely before א, never before ר, e. g. נַחַם, נַאֵץ, תַּעֵב, מַהֵר, שַׁחֵתוּ. (2) It is more likely to occur in the body of a word than after a prefix, e. g. יְחַלְּתִי Ps. 119 : 43 from יָחַל, but יַחְלֹק Job 38 : 24 from חָלַק. (3) When the guttural comes to stand at the end of the word the short vowel is often resumed, e. g. תָּעַר, תִּתְרַע Prov. 22 : 24 from תִּתְרֶה Ps. 141 : 8 from תֶּעְרֶה but תִּתְגָּר Deut. 2 : 9. There are a very few instances in which Daghesh-forte is found in ר, e. g. פֻּרַת שֻׁרֵּךְ Ezek. 16 : 4, מָרַת Prov. 14 : 10, מַעֲנֶה־רַּךְ Prov. 15 : 1 (in some editions), שֶׁרֹּאשִׁי Cant. 5 : 2, see also § 24. *b.*

§ 61. The concurrence of consonants gives rise to the following vowel changes, viz. :

1. When two vowelless letters come together at the beginning of a syllable in contravention of the law in § 18, the impossible combination is relieved by giving to the first of them a short vowel. This, if there be no reason for preferring another, will be the briefest of the vowels, Hhirik, e. g.

חִזְקוּ for חִזְקוּ‎, בְּדְבַּר for בְּדַבֵּר‎, דִּבְרֵי for דִּבְרֵי‎. If a vowel has been omitted from the word, the corresponding short vowel is frequently employed, e. g. מַלְכֵי for מְלָכֵי from מֶלֶךְ (מֶלֶךְ‎); יָחֹן from יָחֹן‎. Or יָחְנְךָ for יָחְנְךָ from יָחֹן‎; הֶבְלֵי from הֶבֶל‎, מַלְכֹו from מָלֹךְ‎. Or if one of the consonants be a guttural, the vowel mostly conforms to the compound Sh'va, which it has or might have, e. g. לַחְפֹּר for לַחְפֹּר‎, לְחָלִי for לְחָלִי‎, יֶחֶזְקוּ for יֶחֶזְקוּ‎, עֲבָדֵי for עֲבָדֵי‎, פְּעֻלָּה for פְּעֻלָּה‎, לַחְפֹּר‎.

a. Vav before a guttural follows the rule just given; before ר‎, and sometimes before ה or ח followed by י‎, it takes Hhirik; before other vowelless letters it gives up its consonant sound and quiesces in its homogeneous vowel Shurek, § 57. 2. (1), thus וְהָיוּ‎, וִיהִי‎, וַעֲבָדֹו and וּלְבַב‎, וֶחֱלֵה‎, וּזָהָב‎.

b. In triliteral monosyllables or final syllables with the vowel Pattahh, the first letter sometimes receives an accented Seghol. to which the following Pattahh is then assimilated, e. g. פֶּתַח for פֶּתַח construct of פֶּתַח‎, מַמְלֶכֶת for מַמְלֶכֶת‎, the Seghols being liable to be changed to Pattahhs by the presence of a guttural מִשְׁפַּחַת for מִשְׁפַּחַת‎.

c. In מֹצַאֲכֶם Gen. 32:20 for מֹצַאֲכֶם the vowelless letters belong to different syllables, and the introduction of the new vowel makes it necessary to lengthen the one before it.

2. Although two vowelless letters are admissible at the end of a word, § 18, the harshness of the combination is commonly relieved by the insertion of Seghol, e. g. יֶרֶב for יֶרֶב‎, לֶכֶת for לֶכֶת‎. If either letter is a guttural, Pattahh is mostly used instead, e. g. רַחַן‎, פֹּעַל‎, נֶצַח‎. If either letter is י‎, its homogeneous vowel Hhirik is used; if the second letter is ו‎, it will rest in Shurek, § 57. 2. (4.), e. g. תֹּהוּ‎, כְּלִי‎, בַּיִת‎, but מָוֶת‎.

a. When the penultimate letter is ה or ח‎, it in a few instances takes Seghol, as רֶחֶם‎, לֶחֶם‎, בֹּהֶן‎, אֹהֶל‎. When the final letter is א‎, it either remains otiant, § 16, or requires Seghol, פֶּרֶא‎, הֶרֶא‎, וַיַּרְא‎, שָׁוְא‎; a penultimate א either quiesces in the antecedent vowel or attracts it to itself, § 60. 3. *c*, שֵׂאת‎, שְׁאֵת or שָׂאת‎, רֹאשׁ‎, וַיֵּאָת‎. The alternate mode of facilitating the pronunciation of gutturals before a vowelless letter at the end of a word by means of Pattahh furtive, has been explained § 60. 2.

3. When the same letter is repeated with or without a mutable vowel intervening, there is often a contraction into

one doubled letter, and the vowel is rejected or thrown back upon the preceding consonant, e. g. יִסֹּבּוּ for יִסַּבְבוּ, יָסֹב for יִסְבֹּב (Daghesh-forte disappearing at the end of the word), יְכֹנְנוּ for יְכוֹנְנוּ Job 31 : 15 for כוֹנְנוּ (see 4. below); if another consonant immediately follow the contracted letters, a diphthongal vowel יִ or וֹ may be inserted to render the re-duplication more audible and prevent the concurrence of three consonants, תְּסֻבֶּינָה, סַבּוֹתִי.

4. In accented syllables the diphthongal vowels *e* and *o* are employed before two consonants or a doubled consonant in preference to the pure *ī* and *ū*, e. g. קוּם; תְּשֵׁבְנָה, תָּשִׁיב; וַיֻּבַּךְ, קֹשְׁטְ, so תַּקְטֵלְנָה, הָסֵבִּי, תַּקְטֵיל; קִמֶּינָה. This is still the case when at the end of a word an auxiliary Seghol or Pattahh has been inserted between the letters (according to 2.), e. g. מֵינֶקֶת from מֵינִיק, פֹּעַל, סֵפֶר, רַגֶּבְ, רַנֶּּךְ, or the reduplication of the doubled letter is no longer heard and the Daghesh-forte does not appear, § 25, e. g. הֵסֵב comp. הִקְטִיל.

   a. The vowel *ē* is in like circumstances often reduced to one of its con-stituents *a*, e. g. תֵּלֵךְ from תֵּלֵכְנָה, קָטֵל from קְטַלְתִּי, הִקְטִיל from הִקְטַלְתִּי, הֵסַבּוּ, תְּזַבַּרְנָה, תֵּלַדְנָה, and occasionally to its other constituent *i*, e. g. יָרֵשׁ from יְרִשְׁתֶּם, הִתְקַדֵּשׁ from הִתְקַדִּשְׁתֶּם. The only example of Shurek in a Segholate form is תְּשׁוּמֶת Lev. 5 : 21.

5. In unaccented syllables *ĭ* and *ŭ* are preferred to *ĕ* and *ŏ* before doubled letters, הֵסַבֹּת from תַּתִּי; תֵּרְדְ, תֵּרַ; אִתִּי, אֶת־; comp. חֻקִּי, חָק, מָקְטָל, מַגָּשׁ; יִסֹּבֵּנִי, וַיָּסָב; הֵסַב, though such forms as מָלְאָה, כַּרַת, עֻזִּי, הַפְּנִי likewise occur.

6. A vowel is occasionally given to a final consonant to soften the termination of the word, and make the transition easier to the initial consonant of that which follows; thus, הֹפֶךְ; אַוֶּה, אִי; אֵלֶּה, אֶל; הֵמָּה, הֵם; גָּלַת for גָּלְתָה; לַיְלָה, לַיִל, לֵיל; יְכַסְיֻמוּ Ex. 15 : 10; כָּסָמוֹ; הִתַּתּוֹ, חַיַּת; מַגְבִּיתִי, מַגְבִּיהַ; הֹפְכִי Ex. 15 : 5.

   a. These paragogic vowels have established themselves in the cur-rent forms of certain words, as פִּי, אָחִי, אָבִי, אֵלֶּה, הֵמָּה, לַיְלָה. But,

with these exceptions, they are chiefly found in poetry. The vowels ִי
and וֹ are mostly attached to words in what is called the construct state,
הָ to words in the absolute; and all of them to the feminine ending ת.
Examples of וֹ: בְּנוֹ Num. 23 : 18, 24 : 3, 15, חֲזֵתוֹ several times, מַעְיְנוֹ Ps.
114 : 8. Examples of ִי: אֹהַבְתִּי Hos. 10 : 11, אֹסְרִי Gen. 49 : 11, בְּנִי ibid.,
גְּנֻבְתִי Gen. 31 : 39, דִּבַּרְתִּי Ps. 110 : 4, הֹפְכִי Ps. 114 : 8, יֹשְׁבִי Ps. 123 : 1,
מוֹשִׁיבִי Ps. 113 : 5, מַשְׁפִּילִי ver. 6, מְקִימִי ver. 7, הוֹשִׁיבִי ver. 8,
מַגְבִּיהִי ver. 9, מְלֵאֲתִי Isa. 1 : 21, נֶאְדָרִי Ex. 15 : 6, עֹזְבִי Zech. 11 : 17, רַבָּתִי Lam.
1 : 1, שָׁלָתִי ibid., שֹׁכְנִי Deut. 33 : 16. It is also attached to the first member
of the compound in many proper names, e. g. מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק, גַּבְרִיאֵל, to certain
particles, as מִנִּי, זוּלָתִי, בִּלְתִּי, and perhaps to such participial forms as
יֹשַׁבְתִּי Jer. 22 : 23. Of הָ: אֵימָתָה Ex. 15 : 16, אַרְצָה Isa. 8 : 23, Job 34 : 13,
37 : 12, חַרְסָה Judg. 14 : 18, יְשׁוּעָתָה Ps. 3 : 3, 80 : 3, Jon. 2 : 10, לַיְלָה almost
constantly, מָוְתָה Ps. 116 : 15, נַחֲלָה Num. 34 : 5, Ps. 124 : 4, עוֹלָתָה Ps. 92 : 16
(K'ri), 125 : 3, Ezek. 28 : 15, Hos. 10 : 13, עֹלָתָה Job 5 : 16, עֶזְרָתָה Ps. 44 : 27,
63 : 8, 94 : 17, צַפְתָה Job 10 : 22, תִּמְנָתָה Josh. 19 : 43, Judg. 14 : 1, and regu-
larly in the third person feminine of the preterite of לה verbs. In
modern Persian *i* is similarly appended to nouns in close connection with a
following word, to remove the obstruction of the final consonant and serve
as a uniting link.

§ 62. The changes due to the influence of vowels may
arise from their concurrence or proximity.

1. Concurring vowels may coalesce; *a* uniting with *a*
forms *a*, uniting with *i* or *u* it forms the diphthongal *e* or *o*,
e. g. הָשְׁפוֹת Neh. 3 : 13 from הָאַשְׁפוֹת after the rejection of א
by § 53. 2. *b;* בַּיִת after the softening of י to *i* becomes בֵּית;
קְטָלָהוּ by the rejection of ה becomes קְטָלוֹ; יְהוֹ prefixed to
proper names is from יְהוֹ for יַחְךְ, § 57. 2 (4).

2. One of them may be hardened into its corresponding
semi-vowel; ִי with ִי may form ִי, or the first *ī* may
be changed to *ĭy*, which, upon the reduplication of the י to
preserve the brevity of the antecedent vowel, § 24. 3, becomes
ִיִ, e. g. עִבְרִי with ִים becomes עִבְרִיִּים or עִבְרִים. So, ִי be-
fore הָ forms יָה, and before וֹ forms יוֹ, e. g. עִבְרִיָּה,
עִבְרִיּוֹת; in like manner וּ is changed before וֹ into *ŭv*, form-
ing וּוֹ, which, by § 56. 3, becomes יוֹ, e. g. מַלְכוּת, by the
substitution of וֹת for ת, מַלְכִיּוֹת. *Ī* ִי followed by *ū* וּ forms
īv, הֵמִסִּירוּ for הֵמִסִּירוּ Josh. 14 : 8. פִּיו, פִּיהוּ; קְטַלְתִּיו, קְטַלְתִּיהוּ,
Ē ֵי before *ī* ִי or *ū* וּ is resolved into *ăy*, which, joined with
the appropriate semi-vowels, becomes ַי and ַיו, the virtual

reduplication of the final consonant in the one case preserving the short vowel, which is lengthened in the other; thus סֻסִּ with יִ becomes סוּסִי, and with הוּ, סוּסָיו. The same resolution of יִ occurs before final דּ, forming יִךְ, and by § 61. 2 יִךָ, thus נְעוּרֵי with ךָ becomes נְעוּרָיִךְ.

a. Grammarians have disputed whether in such words as עִבְרִיִּים, מַלְכֻיּוֹת the point in י is Daghesh-forte or Mappik, § 26, and accordingly whether they are to be read *ibhriyyīm*, *malkhuyyōth*, or *ibhrīyīm*, *malkhūyōth*. If the explanation given above be correct, it is Daghesh-forte Conservative. Comp. קַיָּם, קָם.

b. Such forms as פְּרִי. פְּרִיוֹ, פְּרְיָם from פְּרִי are only apparent exceptions to the above rules. The word is properly פִּרְי, and to this the additions are made, the auxiliary Hhirik being dropped with the cessation of the cause from which it originated, § 57. 2. (4). In עַרְבִיאִים 2 Chron. 17:11 from עַרְבִי and ים the vowels are kept separate by an interposed א.

c. In words of לֹה formation, such as עָשִׂים, עָשׂוּ, עָשְׂתָה from עָשָׂה and ה, וּ, ים, it might appear as though one vowel were rejected before another. But the correct explanation is that י is the true final radical, and the forms above given are for עֲשִׂים, עֲשָׂיוּ, עֲשָׂיְתָה (like קְטֹלִים) from which י is rejected by § 53. 3. In the same way עָשׂוּ, עָשְׂךָ, etc., from עָשָׂה are for עֲשָׂיוּ, עֲשָׂיְךָ. In such alternate forms as פָּרְיָה from פֹּרֶה, the radical י is retained by preserving the antecedent vowel, which, before Daghesh-forte Conservative, becomes Hhirik, § 61. 5.

§ 63. The following euphonic changes are attributable to the proximity of vowels, viz. :

1. Pattahh before a guttural is often changed to Seghol if another *a* follows, and the same change sometimes occurs after a guttural if another *a* precedes.

The particular cases are the following :

a. When (ַ) stands before a guttural with (ָ) always before ה, e. g. הֶחָג for הַחָג, מִבְטֶחָה Prov. 21:22. הֶחָכָם, הֶנֶּחָמְתִּי (also when ה has Hhateph Kamets, e. g. הֶחֳלַלְתִּי, הֶחֳדָשִׁים Judg. 9:9), often before ה and ע, particularly if it receives the secondary accent, e. g. הֶחָרִים for הַחָרִים, חֶרָה, rarely before א and ר, מֶה עָשִׂיתָ, הֶעְלָה; הֶשְׁחַרוּ, לַחֶבֶת but לֶהָבָה Gen. 14:10, נֶאֱצֹת Neh. 9:18, 26 but נָאֲצוֹתֶיךָ Ezek. 35:12.

b. When (ַ) before a guttural is followed by another consonant with (ְ) or (ֲ) יֶחְדְּל, יֶחְדְּלוּ but יַחְדְּלוּ, נֶחְבָּא but נֶחְבְּאת, נֶחְבָּאת, יֶחְטָא, once before the liquid ל, e. g. אֶכְלְךָ Ex. 33:3 for אַכְלְךָ, and once before כ, e. g. לֶחֶנְנָהּ for לְחַנְנָהּ.

c. In וָאֶקְרָאֶה 1 Sam. 28:15 and the combination עוֹלָם וָעֶד a similar change takes place after a guttural to prevent the repetition of the vowel *a*; so in יִדְרְשֶׁנָּה Ps. 20:4, and אָנָה וָאָנָה after the liquid נ.

2. Pattahh is sometimes assimilated to a following Seghol, or to a preceding Kamets or Tsere.

a. The assimilation to (ֶ) takes place regularly in what are called Segholate forms, in which an auxiliary Seghol has by § 61. 2 been introduced between two vowelless letters, מֶלֶךְ for מַלְךְ, חֶרֶב for חַרְב, אֶרֶץ for אַרְץ, but בַּיִת, פַּעַם; only before ו, which can combine with *a* and not with *e*, *a* is retained and lengthened to (ָ) by § 59, תָּוֶךְ, אָוֶן. Rarely in other cases וַדְכֶּם for וַדְכָּם, where the change is facilitated by the preceding י.

b. The assimilation to (ָ) occurs in a few cases after a guttural with הָ prefixed, e. g. הָאָרֶץ for הָאֶרֶץ, הָהָר for הָהֶר, הָעָם for הָעֶם.

c. The assimilation to (ֵ) occurs in the Kal future of Pe Yodh verbs where the alternate forms are יֵשֵׁב and יִירַץ.

§ 64. The following vowel changes are due to the accent, viz. :

1. If a long vowel in a mixed syllable be deprived of its accent, it will be shortened, § 18, e. g. יָסֹב, הִשָּׁמֵר, הִשָּׁמֶר; יַעֲזֹב־יַעֲזֹב; וַיָּשֶׂם, יָשֵׂם; וַיָּסָב.

a. If a vowel preceding Makkeph is incapable of being shortened, it will receive the secondary accent Methegh, agreeably to § 43.

2. The accent prefers to be immediately preceded by a simple syllable and a long vowel. Accordingly an antecedent vowelless letter often receives what may be called a pretonic vowel. This is commonly the simplest of the long vowels *ā*, e. g. יֶחְדְּלוּן, לְקָחַת, יָסֹב, קָטַל, occasionally *ē*, e. g. תֵּאָבֵדוּן, יֵלֵדוּן, שֵׁמוֹת, יֵקַל, rarely *ō*, e. g. יִקְצֹרוּן. Such a vowel is sometimes inserted, even though a pre-existing mixed syllable is thereby destroyed, e. g. in the plurals of Segholates and of feminine nouns derived from them, מְלָכִים from מֶלֶךְ, מְלָכוֹת from מַלְכָּה.

§ 65. The special emphasis, with which the last word of a clause is dwelt upon, gives rise to certain vowel changes in connection with the pause accents, § 36. 2. *a*. These are (1) lengthening short vowels, viz., (ַ) and not infrequently (ֶ) which has arisen from (ַ) to (ָ), e. g. אָמַר, אָמָר; כָּתַבְתְּ, כָּתָבְתְּ; עָבַד, עָבָד; אֶרֶץ, אָרֶץ; and bringing back Kamets

Hhatuph shortened from Hholem to its original length וַיָּמָת,
וַיָּמֹת. (2) Restoring vowels which have been dropped
in the course of inflection, e. g. דִּבְּרוּ , דִּבְרוּ ; עָבְדוּ , עֲבָדוּ;
עָמְדוּ , עֲמָדוּ. (3) Changing simple Sh'va in triliteral sylla-
bles and before the suffix ךָ to Seghol, e. g. בֵּיתְךָ , בֵּיתֶךָ ; יְחִי,
יֶחִי ; שְׁכֶם , שֶׁכֶם. (4) Changing compound Sh'va to the cor-
responding long vowel, e. g. אֲנִי , אָנִי ; חֲצִי (חֲצִיוֹ), חָצִי ; חֳלִי , חֲלִי;
חָלִי.

a. Pattahh sometimes remains without change, e. g. עַד Ps. 132 : 12,
הִבְרַח 2 Sam. 2 : 27, נִצַּלְנוּ Jer. 7 : 10, גָּנַבְתִּי Prov. 30 : 9, צָדַקְתִּי Job 34 : 5,
אָכַלְתִּי Neh. 5 : 14. Seghol more frequently, דֶּרֶךְ , קֶדֶם , צֶדֶק , מֶלֶךְ , and
דָּרֶךְ. Long vowels are mostly unaltered ; only Tsere is in mixed syllables
occasionally changed to Pattahh, e. g. הַתֵּז Isa. 18 : 5 for הֵתֵז, so חָשַׁב:
Isa. 42 : 22, הֵפַר: Gen. 17 : 14, וַיִּגָּמַל Gen. 21 : 8, וַיֵּלֶךְ Gen. 25 : 34, which,
in one word of Segholate formation, is converted to Seghol, e. g. רֶשַׁע,
רֶשַׁע. Where the same word has alternate forms, one is sometimes se-
lected as the ordinary and the other as the pausal form, thus יַחְפֹּץ , יַחְפֵּץ;
שָׁכַלְתִּי , שָׁכֻלְתִּי: Gen. 43 : 14 ; דְּרָבָן , דָּרְבֹן Eccl.
12 : 11, דָּרְבֹן 1 Sam. 13 : 21 ; עֹז , עָז Gen. 49 : 3, תֵּשַׁבַּת , תִּשְׁבֹּת Lev.
26 : 34, 35 ; רְפָשׂוּ , רְפָשֹׁט. Sometimes, instead of changing the Sh'va be-
fore ךָ to Seghol, its vowel is shifted thus בְּךָ , בֶּךָ . לָךְ . עִמָּךְ , אֹתָךְ, and in
Ex. 29 : 35 אֹתְכָה. The position of the pause accent, so far as it differs
from that of the ordinary accent, has been explained § 35. 2.

b. Of the pause accents, or those which mark the limits of clauses and
sections, the first class, viz., Silluk, Athnahh, and Merka with Mahpakh,
almost always give rise to the vowel changes which have been described ;
the second and third classes, S'gholta, Zakeph Katon, Zakeph Gadhol,
R'bhi^a and Shalsheleth, e. g. וְנִבְהָלוּ Isa. 13 : 8, do so frequently ; the fourth
class, Pazer, e. g. 2 Kin. 3 : 25, Prov. 30 : 4, and T'lisha Gh'dhola, e. g.
Ezek. 20 : 21, but seldom. Pausal forms are occasionally found with other
Disjunctives, thus, Tiphhha הֵלֵכוּ Deut. 13 : 5, Pashta תָּשְׁמִרֵהּ ibid., Geresh
שָׁמָע Ezek. 40 : 4, and even with Conjunctives, e. g. אָנִי Isa. 49 : 18, הִרְצָלַח
Ezek. 17 : 15, גֹּשׁוּ 2 Chron. 29 : 31.

§66. 1. The shortening and lengthening of words has an effect upon their vowels. The shortening may take place

(1) At the end of a word by the rejection of a vowel.

This occurs only with (ֶ) or (ֵ) in certain forms of לה verbs, e. g. תִּגֶל from
תִּגְלֶה, וַיֵּשְׁתְּ for וַיִּשְׁתֶּה , וַיֵּתְ for וַיֵּתֶה 1 Sam. 21 : 14 for וַיְצַו , וַיָּתָו for וַיִּצֶּה. In
the last two examples the short vowel is lengthened upon its receiving the
accent, comp. §64.1. If the rejected vowel was preceded by two con-
sonants, these will now stand together at the end of the word, and be lia-
ble to the changes described §61.2, e. g. הֶרֶף for הַרְפֵּה.

(2) In the body of a word by shortening a long vowel in a mixed syllable, which must, of course, be the one bearing the accent, § 32. 1, or rejecting a long vowel in a simple syllable before the accent (the pretonic vowel, § 64. 2), דָּבָר, מִקְדָּשׁ; מִקְדַּשׁ; מֶלֶךְ, מַלְךְ; דְּבַר.

a. This is in general the only reduction possible. The vowel of a mixed syllable, if short already, is capable of no further abbreviation; and it cannot be rejected, or there would be a concurrence of voweless consonants which the language seeks to avoid (תּוֹסְךְ Prov. 30:6 is an exception). And the vowel of a simple syllable, if short, must have the accent, § 32. 1, which preserves it from rejection. The changes above recited are confined to the last two, or, in case the accent is upon the penult, the last three syllables of the word; for the antecedent portions of polysyllables are already abbreviated to the utmost. Contractions due to the peculiarities of certain letters, as the gutturals and quiescents, which have been before explained, are not here taken into the account, e. g. שָׁמַע, שְׁמַע; יָדֵד, יָדִים; מוֹת, מָוֶת.

b. Where the last vowel cannot be shortened, it sometimes experiences a change of quality from pure to diphthongal, such as is produced by the pressure of two following consonants, § 61. 4, e. g. הוֹשִׁיב, וַיַּבְדֵּל, יַבְדִּיל; סוּסֵר, סוּסִים; רָשֹׁב, רָשֹׁב; רָשֹׁת, רָשִׁית; הוֹשֵׁב.

2. If a word be lengthened by additions at the end, its vowels are liable to changes in consequence.

(1) Such additions create a tendency to shorten the previous part of the word in the manner just described. For the normal length of words in Hebrew being dissyllabic, the genius of the language is opposed to transcending this limit any further than is absolutely necessary. If the addition is not of sufficient weight to affect the position of the accent, no abbreviation results. But if it is of weight enough to remove the accent, an abbreviation follows if it is possible for one to be made, e. g. דְּבָר, דְּבָרִים, דִּבְרֵיכֶם for דִּבְרֵיכֶם by § 61. 1.

(2) They produce changes in an ultimate mixed syllable. If the appendage begin with a consonant, the antecedent vowel will now be succeeded by two consonants and be liable to the changes consequent upon such a position, § 61. 4, e. g. הִקְטִיל from הִקְטַלְתִּי; קוּם from קָמְנָה; הַקְטִיל from תַּקְטֵלְנָה;

קְטַלְתִּי from קְטֹל . If the appendage begin with a vowel, it will attach itself to the final consonant, which will in consequence be drawn away from its own syllable to begin the new one. This may occasion the following changes :

(*a*) If the preceding vowel is an auxiliary Seghol or Pattahh, introduced to facilitate the pronunciation of the second of two vowelless consonants, § 61. 2, it will be rejected, inasmuch as it is no longer required for this purpose, e. g. מַלְכּוֹ from מֶלֶךְ , סִתְרוֹ from סֵתֶר .

(*b*) If it be a short vowel, it must either be lengthened to adapt it to the simple syllable in which it now stands, or rejected on account of the disposition to abbreviate words upon their receiving accessions at the end, e. g. קְטָלָה and קָטְלָה from קָטַל . The cases are very rare in which a short vowel remains unchanged in consequence of its having the accent, § 18. 2, e. g. מִדְבָּרָה 1 Kin. 19 : 15 from מִדְבָּר , חַשְׁמַלָה Ezek. 8 : 2 from חַשְׁמַל .

(*c*) If it be a long vowel, it may be rejected, as יִקְטְלוּ from יִקְטֹל , שִׁמְי from שֵׁם , or retained either unaltered, as הֲקִימֹותָ from הֵקִים , מִשְׁכָּנִי from מִשְׁכָּן , or with a change of quality from pure to diphthongal or the reverse, מְתוּקָה from פָּלִיט , פְּלֵטִים from הֵקִים , הֲקֵמֹנוּ from נָסֹוג , נְסוּגֹתִי from מָתֹוק .

TABLE SHOWING THE CHARACTER AND AFFINITIES OF THE VOWELS
AND THE ORDINARY LIMITS OF EUPHONIC CHANGES.

ORGAN.	QUALITY.	QUANTITY	
		Long.	*Short.*
Guttural, . . .	*pure*	$\bar{a}$	$\breve{a}$
Palatal, . . .	{ *diphthongal*	$\bar{e}$	$\breve{e}$
	{ *pure*	$\bar{\imath}$	$\breve{\imath}$
Labial, . . .	{ *diphthongal*	$\bar{o}$	$\breve{o}$
	{ *pure*	$\bar{u}$	$\breve{u}$